

THE CYPRUS REVIEW

A Journal of Social, Economic and Political Issues

Christalla Yakinthou

The Quiet Deflation of Den Xehno? Changes in the Greek Cypriot
Communal Narrative on the Missing Persons in Cyprus

Nicos Peristianis and **Katerina Kokkinou**

Single-Parent Families in Cyprus

Mashoed Bailie and **Bekir Azgin**

A Barricade, a Bridge and a Wall:
Cypriot Journalism and the Mediation of Conflict in Cyprus

Olga Demetriou

Reading the Paratexts of the Cyprus Conflict:
Policy, Science, and the Pursuit of 'Objectivity'

Theodora Christodoulidou

The Legal Status of the Buffer Zone in Cyprus

Commentary Article by

Panayiotis Constanti

Book Reviews

Murat Metin Hakki

The Cyprus Issue: A Documentary History, 1878-2007

Frank Hoffmeister

Legal Aspects of the Cyprus Problem: Annan Plan and EU Accession

Clement Dodd

Update on the Cyprus Conflict

Stephanos Stephanides

Cultures of Memory / Memories of Culture

Nicos Philippou

Coffee House Embellishments

Nursin Atesoglu Guney

Contentious Issues of Security and the Future of Turkey

Gunther Hauser and Franz Kernic

European Security in Transition

Volume 20

Spring 2008

Number 1

Published by **UNIVERSITY OF NICOSIA**

VOLUME 20
NUMBER 1

THE
CYPRUS
REVIEW

A Journal of Social, Economic and Political Issues

The Cyprus Review, a Journal of
Social, Economic and Political
Issues, P.O. Box 24005, 1700
Nicosia, Cyprus.
Telephone: 22-353702 ext 301, 22-841500
E-mail: cy_review@unic.ac.cy
Telefax: 22-353682, 22-357481,
www.unic.ac.cy

To access site:

> Research

> UNic Publications

Subscription Office:

The Cyprus Review

University of Nicosia

46 Makedonitissas Avenue

1700 Nicosia, Cyprus

Copyright: © 2008 University of Nicosia,
Cyprus.

ISSN 1015-2881.

All rights reserved.

No restrictions on photo-copying.

Quotations from The Cyprus Review
are welcome, but acknowledgement
of the source must be given.

TCR Staff

Editor in Chief: Hubert Faustmann

Co-Editors: James Ker-Lindsay

Craig Webster

Book Reviews Editor: Olga Demetriou

Managing Editor: Nicos Peristianis

Assistant Editor: Christina McRoy

Editorial Board

VOLUME 20
NUMBER 1

Costas M. Constantinou

Keele University, UK

Ayla Gürel

Cyprus Centre of International Peace
Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO)

Maria Hadjipavlou

University of Cyprus

Mete Hatay

Cyprus Centre of International Peace
Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO)

Yiannis E. Ioannou

University of Cyprus

Joseph Joseph

University of Cyprus

Michael Kammas

Director General, Association of
Cyprus Commercial Banks

Erol Kaymak

Political Science Association, Cyprus

Costas P. Kyrris

Ex-Director of Cyprus Research
Centre, Cyprus

Diana Markides

University of Cyprus

Caesar Mavratsas

University of Cyprus

Farid Mirbagheri

University of Nicosia, Cyprus

Maria Roussou

The Pedagogical Institute of Cyprus /
Ministry of Education & Culture, Cyprus

Andrekos Varnava

European University Cyprus

International Advisory Board

VOLUME 20
NUMBER 1

Peter Allen

Rhode Island College, USA

Othon Anastasakis

University of Oxford, UK

Floya Anthias

Roehampton University London, UK

Vassos Argyrou

University of Hull, UK

Heinz-Jürgen Axt

University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany

Gilles Bertrand

Institut d'Etudes Politiques de
Bordeaux, France

Hansjörg Brey

Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft, Germany

Van Coufoudakis

Indiana University-Purdue University
(Emeritus), USA

Thomas Diez

University of Birmingham, UK

Paul Gibbs

University of Middlesex, UK

Evanthis Hatzivassiliou

University of Athens, Greece

Robert Holland

School of Advanced Study,
University of London, UK

Marios Katsioloudes

Hellenic American University
Athens, Greece

John T.A. Koumoulides

Woodrow Wilson Centre, USA

Klearchos A. Kyriakides

University of Hertfordshire, UK

Peter Loizos

London School of Economics, UK

Yael Navaro-Yashin

University of Cambridge, UK

Phedon Nicolaidis

European Institute of Public
Administration, The Netherlands

Kalypso Nicolaidis

University of Oxford, UK

Oliver P. Richmond

University of St Andrews,
Scotland, UK

Heinz A. Richter

University of Mannheim, Germany

Robert I. Rotberg

Kennedy School of Government,
Harvard University, USA

Julie Scott

London Metropolitan University, UK

Zenon Stavrinides

University of Leeds, UK

Nathalie Tocci

Istituto Affari Internazionali, Italy

NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

The Cyprus Review is an international bi-annual refereed journal which publishes articles on a range of areas in the social sciences including primarily Anthropology, Business Administration, Economics, History, International Relations, Politics, Psychology, Public Administration and Sociology, and secondarily, Geography, Demography, Law and Social Welfare, pertinent to Cyprus. As such it aims to provide a forum for discussion on salient issues relating to the latter. The journal was first published in 1989 and has since received the support of many scholars internationally.

Articles should be original and should not be under consideration elsewhere.

Submission Procedure:

Manuscripts should be sent to the Editors, The Cyprus Review, University of Nicosia, 46 Makedonitissas Avenue, P.O.Box 24005, 1700 Nicosia, Cyprus.

Formatting Requirements:

(i) Articles should normally range between 4000-9000 words.

(ii) Manuscripts should be typed on one side of A4 double-spaced; submitted in four hard copies together with a CD or 3.5 inch disk compatible with Microsoft Word saved as rich text format. Manuscripts can be forwarded electronically (saved as an attachment) to: cy_review@unic.ac.cy
Pages should be numbered consecutively.

As manuscripts may be sent out anonymously for editorial evaluation, the author's name should appear on a separate covering page. The author's full academic address and a brief biographical paragraph (approximately 60-100 words) detailing current affiliation and areas of research interest and publications should also be included.

Manuscripts and disks will **not** be returned.

(iii) An abstract of no more than 150 words should be included on a separate page together with keywords to define the article's content (maximum 10 words).

(iv) Headings should appear as follows:

Title: centred, capitalised, bold e.g.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE-MAKING IN CYPRUS

Subheadings: I. Centred, title case, bold.

II. Left-align, title case, bold, italics.

III. Left-align, title case, italics.

(v) Quotations must correspond to the original source in wording, spelling and punctuation. Any alternations to the original should be noted (e.g. use of ellipses to indicate omitted information; editorial brackets to indicate author's additions to quotations). Quotation marks (" ") are to be used to denote direct quotes and inverted commas (' ') to denote a quote within a quotation.

(vi) Notes should be used to provide additional comments and discussion or for reference purposes (see vii below) and should be numbered consecutively in the text and typed on a separate sheet of paper at the end of the article. Acknowledgements and references to grants should appear within the endnotes.

(vii) References: As the The Cyprus Review is a multi-disciplinary journal, either of the following formats are acceptable for references to source material in the text:

(a) surname, date and page number format OR

(b) endnote references.

Full references should adhere to the following format:

Books, monographs:

James, A. (1990) *Peacekeeping in International Politics*. London, Macmillan.

Multi-author volumes:

Foley, C. and Scobie, W. I. (1975) *The Struggle for Cyprus*. Starport, CA, Hoover Institution Press.

Articles and chapters in books:

Jacovides, A. J. (1977) 'The Cyprus Problem and the United Nations' in Attalides, M. (ed.), *Cyprus Reviewed*. Nicosia, Jus Cypri Association.

Journal articles:

McDonald, R. (1986) 'Cyprus: The Gulf Widens', *The World Today*, Vol. 40, No. 11, p. 185.

(viii) Dates should appear as follows: 3 October 1931; 1980s; twentieth century. One to ten should appear as written and above ten in numbers (11, 12 etc.).

(ix) Tables and figures should be included in the text and be numbered consecutively with titles.

(x) **Book review** headings should appear as follows: Title, author, publisher, place, date, number of pages, e.g. *Cyprian Edge*, by Nayia Roussou, Livadiotis Ltd (Nicosia, 1997) 78 pp. The ISBN reference should also be quoted. Reviewer's name to appear at the end of the review. Guidance notes are available from <cy_review@unic.ac.cy>

(xi) First proofs may be read and corrected by contributors if they provide the Editors with an address through which they can be reached without delay and can guarantee return of the corrected proofs within seven days of receiving them.

(xii) Each author will receive two complimentary copies of the issue in which their article appears in addition to five offprints.

(xiii) Articles submitted to the journal should be unpublished material and must not be reproduced for one year following publication in *The Cyprus Review*.

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in the articles and reviews published in this journal are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the University of Nicosia, The Advisory Editorial Board or the Editors.

Indexing: The contents of The Cyprus Review are now indexed in the following publications: Bulletin Signalitiques en Sciences, Humanities et Sociales; International Bibliography of the Social Sciences; PAIS-Public Affairs Information Service; Sociological Abstracts; Social Planning, Policy and Development Abstracts and Reviews; Peace Research Abstracts Journal; ICSSR Journal of Abstracts and Reviews; Sociology and Social Anthropology; International Bibliography of Periodical Literature; International Bibliography of Book Reviews; International Political Science Abstracts; EMBASE, Compendex, Geobase and Scopus and other derivative products such as Mosby Yearbooks. In addition, TCR is available internationally via terminals accessing the Dialog, BRS and Data-Star data bases.

The Cyprus Review is disseminated via EBSCO, in their international research database service and subscription network of academic journals.

Advertising: Advertisements are welcomed. No more than ten full pages of advertisements are published per issue. Rates per issue: Full page \$200, €171, UK£125; Half page \$140, €120, UK£90, Back cover \$380, €325, UK£240.

Dear Readers,

This issue of The Cyprus Review sees the inauguration of several significant changes. We hope that these changes will improve its quality, increase the readership and enhance its overall professionalism and efficiency.

The first major announcement is that we will now be disseminating The Cyprus Review via EBSCO, one of the leading international research database services. Our partnership with EBSCO will help make The Cyprus Review more visible amongst the wider academic community. The hope is that this will lead to a larger readership. At the same time, we believe that this increased visibility will lead to more and higher-quality submissions in the future.

Another major change in this issue is the restructuring of the Editorial Board. In the past, there was only one board. From this issue, The Cyprus Review will have an Editorial Board composed of local, Cyprus-based scholars, as well as an International Advisory Board, made up of many of the leading names in our subject working at institutions in Greece, Britain, France, Germany and the United States. We expect that this structure will provide the Review with the all-important element of local ownership, but also ensure that the journal meets the highest international standards.

Finally, we have decided to develop the book reviews section and have appointed Dr Olga Demetriou as Book Reviews Editor, a new post. In addition to allowing the team to work in a more specialised and efficient manner, this will allow us to expand the range of topics we cover, including Cyprus-relevant books on Greece, Turkey and the European Union, as well as on the broader Eastern Mediterranean. Likewise, this should also allow us to review books appearing across a wide range of languages, not least of all Greek and Turkish.

All-in-all, these initial changes are designed to improve the quality and dissemination of the journal, encourage greater participation, and allow our editorial team to work in a more efficient and professional manner. However, we will not stop there. We firmly believe that the Review must continue to evolve and we hope to unveil further changes in due course.

One point that we are keenly aware of is that The Cyprus Review is only as good as its readership. Thus, we hope that you, our readers, will play a part as the process develops. In particular, we welcome high-quality submissions across the range of humanities and social sciences. We also hope that the readership will continue to supply us with useful suggestions to guide us as we continue to improve The Cyprus Review.

We wish you a good reading,

The Editors

THE CYPRUS REVIEW

VOLUME 20
NUMBER 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Christalla Yakinthou The Quiet Deflation of Den Xehno? Changes in the Greek Cypriot Communal Narrative on the Missing Persons in Cyprus	15-33
Nicos Peristianis and Katerina Kokkinou Single-Parent Families in Cyprus	35-55
Mashoed Bailie and Bekir Azgin A Barricade, a Bridge and a Wall: Cypriot Journalism and the Mediation of Conflict in Cyprus	57-92
Olga Demetriou Reading the Paratexts of the Cyprus Conflict: Policy, Science, and the Pursuit of 'Objectivity'	93-113
Theodora Christodoulidou The Legal Status of the Buffer Zone in Cyprus	115-126
Plus Commentary Article by: Panayiotis Constanti Tradition, What Tradition?	129-131
And Book Reviews: The Cyprus Issue: A Documentary History, 1878-2007 Edited by Murat Metin Hakki (I.B. Tauris: London, 2007) 664 pp. (Andrekos Varnava) Legal Aspects of the Cyprus Problem: Annan Plan and EU Accession By Frank Hoffmeister (Martinus Nijhoff Publishers: The Netherlands, 2006) 289 pp. (Kudret Özersay) Update on the Cyprus Conflict By Clement Dodd (The Eothen Press: Huntingdon, Cambs, 2006) iv + 59 + 8 pp. (Erol Kaymak) Cultures of Memory / Memories of Culture By Stephanos Stephanides (The University of Nicosia Press: Cyprus, 2007) xii + 355 pp. and, Coffee House Embellishments By Nicos Philippou (The University of Nicosia Press: Cyprus, 2007) 111 pp. (Paul Gibbs) Contentious Issues of Security and the Future of Turkey Edited by Nursin Atesoglu Guney (Ashgate: Burlington, Vt., 2007) xvii + 197 pp. (Glen D. Camp) European Security in Transition Edited by Gunther Hauser and Franz Kernic (Ashgate: Aldershot, 2006) viii + 216 pp. (George Christou)	135-139 141-144 145-148 149-150 151-155 157-160

CONTRIBUTORS

Bekir Azgin is the chair of the Department of Journalism and the vice-dean of the Faculty of Communication and Media Studies at the Eastern Mediterranean University in Famagusta. He teaches journalism courses and History of Civilizations. Dr Azgin has extensively written on Cypriot politics, Turkish Cypriot media, culture, literature and folklore.

Mashoed Bailie teaches in political economy of communication, media and gender, cultural studies and media literacy at Eastern Mediterranean University in Famagusta, Cyprus. Dr Bailie is the editor of the *Global Media Journal: Mediterranean Edition* and his publications include various articles and book chapters in democratic communication and an edited book [co-edited with Dwayne Winseck] *Democratizing Communication: Comparative Perspectives on Information and Power*, published by Hampton Press.

Glen D. Camp is Professor Emeritus of Political Science at Bryant University in Smithfield, Rhode Island, USA. He completed his university studies at Harvard where he received his AB, MPA, and PhD. He also studied at George Washington University and the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University. He served with the US Information Agency (USIA) in Austria and Germany and the US Agency for International Development (AID) in Washington, DC. Professor Camp is the Amnesty USA specialist for Greece and Cyprus. His academic interests include US foreign policy, international relations, Balkan, and East Mediterranean studies (Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey). He is active in the Association for the Study of Nationalities at Columbia University and participates in the Providence Committee on Foreign Relations and the Providence chapter of the World Affairs Council. He speaks English and German fluently as well as Russian, plus demotic Greek, and some Macedonian and French. He has authored numerous scholarly articles in political science journals.

Theodora Christodoulidou is a human rights lawyer at Lellos P. Demetriades Law Office in Nicosia. She also teaches law at Philips College, Cyprus. Theodora was educated at the University of Athens, where she gained a ptychion in law (1997). She continued her studies at the University of Bristol, where she gained a LL.M in International Law (1998). She subsequently received a scholarship by the (Greek) State Scholarship Foundation (IKY) to pursue her PhD in International Law at King's College London and successfully completed her doctorate 'The Use of Force and the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights' in 2004. In 2005 she was called to the Cyprus Bar. Theodora has published many articles, including 'The Principle of Proportionality in Self-defence and Humanitarian Intervention' in the *Journal of International Law on Peace and Armed Conflict (JILPAC)*; 'Religious Conscientious Objection in Cyprus' in the *Cyprus and European Law Review*, and two Reports on the Situation of Fundamental Rights in Cyprus. She has presented a number of papers at international conferences including a conference organised by the European Society of International Law (ESIL) in Paris (2006).

George Christou (University of Warwick) has a PhD from the University of Sheffield, UK. His research interests include the EU's role in conflict resolution, with an interest in Cyprus and Turkey; Enlargement as EU foreign policy; European Neighbourhood Policy discourse and how it has been received within the eastern and southern dimension; the EU as an international actor in Internet governance and the extent to which the EU has shaped such

governance in the image of its own norms. Selected key publications include: Christou, G. and Simpson, S. (2007), *The New Electronic Marketplace: European Governance Strategies in a Globalising Economy*, London: Edward Elgar; Christou, G. (2006), 'The European Union: What Role in The Cyprus Conflict?' *International Spectator*, Vol. XLI, No. 2, April-June 2006; Christou, G. (2004), *The European Union and Enlargement: The Case of Cyprus*, Basingstoke: Palgrave-MacMillan; Gomez, R. and Christou, G. (2004), 'Economic Foreign Policy: The EU and the Mediterranean', in Carlsnaes, W., Sjursen, H. and White, B., *Contemporary European Foreign Policy*, UK: Sage.

Panayiotis Constanti has an MSc in International Hotel Management from Oxford Brookes University and a Doctorate in Professional Studies from Middlesex University, United Kingdom. He has been teaching in higher education for ten years, having gained extensive 'hands-on' industrial experience prior to becoming an academic. He currently teaches in the fields of human resources and organisational behaviour with his main research interests focusing on people at work and learning and teaching. He has published in a number of academic journals including the *Service Industries Journal*; *Education and Training* and the *International Journal of Education Management*.

Olga Demetriou is an anthropologist, whose work includes research on the politicisation of Turkish minority identities in Greece (PhD, 2002) and the process of political subjectivisation in Cyprus following the opening of the border and accession to the EU. She carried out research at Wolfson College, Cambridge, St Peter's College, Oxford, and at the European Studies Centre, St Antony's College, Oxford. She has written on urban division, border crossings, gender, minority politics, and space. Her work has appeared in international journals such as *Cultural Anthropology*, the *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, *Identities*, and *Ethnic and Racial Studies*.

Paul Gibbs is a Reader at the Institute of Work Based Learning at Middlesex University in the UK. His interests include the nature of work, exploitation and Heidegger. He has published extensively in educational, marketing and business literature.

Erol Kaymak is a lecturer at the Department of International Relations at the Eastern Mediterranean University based in Famagusta. His recent research relates to problematic dynamics of the Cyprus problem, especially where they relate to political sociology. He has published on ethnic politics and on Cyprus in journals including *Mediterranean Politics*, the *European Journal of Political Research*, *The Cyprus Review*, and *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*. He is co-author of the CIVICUS' Civil Society Index report of 2005 for Cyprus. Dr Kaymak has worked with the UN on a project entailing polling in Cyprus, and is currently working with the Centre for European Studies on another survey.

Katerina Kokkinou is a Research Officer of the Research and Institutional Planning of the University of Nicosia. Her research interests focus on the sociology of family and youth, and demography. She has carried out research on several social issues such as: 'The Contemporary State of the Greek-Cypriot Family', 'Single-Parent Families in Cyprus', 'Study for Leisure Time, Employment, Relationships, Perceptions and Problems of the Cypriot Youth', 'Cyprus Youth Dialogue Project' and 'The Development of Citizenship as an Approach towards Preventing Youth Delinquency'.

Kudret Özersay was born in Cyprus in 1973. He Graduated from Ankara University, Faculty of Political Science, Department of International Relations in 1995. He completed his PhD theses titled 'Legal Validity of the 1959-1960 Cyprus Treaties' at the Chair of International Law (Ankara University) in 2002. Asst. Prof. Dr. Özersay has been working as a full-time faculty member at the Department of International Relations, Eastern Mediterranean University in the north of Cyprus since 2003. He has a book and several articles published on the legal dimensions of the Cyprus problem.

Nicos Peristianis is the President of the Council of the University of Nicosia, and of the Cyprus Sociological Association. His research interests relate to social change and its impact on Cypriot social institutions (including the family, education and religion), as well as on nationalism and national identities. In 2003 he coordinated the Cyprus government sponsored study on the 'State of the Family in Contemporary Cyprus', and in 2004 the study on 'Single-Parent Families', sponsored by the Cyprus Research Foundation. Currently he is coordinating the 'Cyprus Youth Dialogue Project', sponsored by UNDP, which looks at the attitudes and values of young people on both sides of the divide.

Andrekos Varnava BA (Honours), Monash University, 2001; PhD, University of Melbourne, 2006. Andrekos Varnava was born and grew up in Melbourne, Australia. He completed his PhD in History at the University of Melbourne. Manchester University Press will publish the revised version, provisionally titled 'Cyprus in the British Imperial Structure, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession', in 2008. He is currently also working on two edited volumes. One (with Dr Hubert Faustmann) is titled 'Reunifying Cyprus: The Annan Plan and Beyond', to be published by I.B. Tauris, also in 2008. The other (with Nicholas Coureas and Marina Elia) is titled 'The Minorities of Cyprus: Development Patterns and the Identity of the Internal-Exclusion' and is to be published by Cambridge Scholars Publishing in 2009. He specialises in the modern history of Cyprus and the British Empire. His focus ranges from military and strategic issues, to social, political and cultural change and development. He also has interests relating to minorities, refugees, human rights, history and memory, and History curriculum studies. In October 2006 he was appointed Assistant Professor in History at Cyprus College, Nicosia, which in 2007 became the European University Cyprus.

Christalla Yakinthou lectures in international relations at Notre Dame University in Western Australia, and is a research fellow at the University of Western Australia. She holds a PhD in political science from the University of Western Australia. Her research interests include political engineering for divided societies, constitutional design, ethnic conflict, and the role of historical memory in peace-making and constitutional engineering. She is a founding member of the Saraswati Institute for Peace and Development Studies, and she can be contacted at <christal@cyllene.uwa.edu.au>.

Articles

VOLUME 20

NUMBER 1



THE QUIET DEFLATION OF DEN XEHNO? CHANGES IN THE GREEK CYPRIOT COMMUNAL NARRATIVE ON THE MISSING PERSONS IN CYPRUS

Christalla Yakinthou

Abstract

Since 2004, there has been movement around the missing persons' issue. The most important set of events has been significant progress by the United Nations' (UN) Committee for Missing Persons (CMP) in locating and exhuming bodies buried in mass graves all over the island. The continual unearthing of remains is keeping the missing persons issue in the public consciousness in a very different way to what has become, over the years, its 'normal' presentation. In addition, there are a number of recent legal cases which may also be significant to the issue's changing public conceptualisation. This paper focuses its attention on the potential of the CMP's progress, the civil cases against the Republic of Cyprus, and the case of Varnavas a.o. v. Turkey to change the public persona of the missing persons issue in Greek-Cypriot society, and points out that any changes to the dynamics of the issue could also have significant impact on the Greek-Cypriot conceptualisation of the Cyprus problem as a whole.

Keywords: Missing Persons, Agnooumenoi, Public Perception of Conflict, Developments in Cyprus Conflict

Until recently, the bodies of approximately 2,000 people who went missing in the conflicts in Cyprus between 1963 and 1974 had still not been found. Of that number, 1,493 are Greek Cypriots who went missing as a result of the 1974 war, and 502 are Turkish Cypriots killed in inter-communal battles between 1963 and 1967, and during the 1974 war.¹ The missing people are important and heavily symbolised aspects of these conflicts for both communities. But, as many studies have shown, each community has created a different symbol of their missing people. This article will concentrate specifically on the Greek-Cypriot representation of the missing persons issue, focusing on identifying possible shifts in the way the issue is conceptualised in the Greek-Cypriot community since the Annan plan's² rejection in 2004. The problem of the missing persons touches on a number of tensions within Greek Cypriot society. It "raises issues of the allocation of responsibility and

culpability, and the tension between civic-political transparency and ethnic responsibility, but is also a means to talk about the past, present and future".³ It is this last point, the idea that the missing persons provide a vehicle for society to conceptualise and talk about the past and the future which has most relevance for this paper.

This paper begins from the following assumption about the importance of the missing persons issue for the Greek-Cypriot conceptualisation of the conflict. The missing persons issue has been demonstrated in a number of studies⁴ to be the purest representation of Greek-Cypriot righteousness and victimhood against the Turkish aggressor. It follows then that its continued existence is therefore critical. The symbol of the tormented woman (mother or wife) dressed in black and holding a photo of her missing loved one to a silent sky is the most powerful symbol of Greek-Cypriot suffering. When this symbol is taken away, or fractured, it also distorts the moral clarity of the greater struggle for victory in the ongoing Cyprus conflict. Equally, healing of the missing persons' trauma would weaken the humanitarian justification for perpetuating the struggle. Therefore, progress on the missing persons issue is hypothesised to have implications for the conflict's visage in Greek-Cypriot society; for its shape, presentation, and perpetuation.

Since 2004, there has been movement around the missing persons' issue. The most important set of events has been significant progress by the United Nations' (UN) Committee for Missing Persons (CMP) in locating and exhuming bodies buried in mass graves all over the island. This is cast against not a single case being resolved by the CMP between 1981 and 2004. Between 2004 and May 2008, 399 people have been exhumed and 84 buried. The continual unearthing of remains is keeping the missing persons issue in the public consciousness in a very different way to what has become, over the years, its 'normal' presentation. In addition, there are a number of recent legal cases which may also be significant to the issue's changing public conceptualisation. In 2002, the Greek-Cypriot families of Christofis Pashas and Charalambos Palmas began legal proceedings against the Republic of Cyprus government, for allegedly withholding information on the whereabouts of their missing loved ones. In 2008, the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) delivered significant findings against the Republic of Turkey in the case of *Varnava a.o. v Turkey*⁵ regarding its responsibility to assist resolution of the missing persons issue in Cyprus, arousing renewed interest in the limited nature of the CMP's mandate in Cyprus. This paper focuses its attention on the potential of the CMP's progress, the civil cases against the Republic of Cyprus, and the case of *Varnavas a.o. v. Turkey* to change the public persona of the missing persons issue, and points out that any changes to the dynamics of the issue could also have significant impact on the Greek-Cypriot conceptualisation of the Cyprus problem as a whole.

Relationship between the ‘Agnooumenoi’ and the Cyprus Conflict

A number of researchers have established that the representation of the missing persons has a very important role in defining the Cyprus conflict for and by Cypriots.⁶ On both sides of the Cyprus divide, the issue of the missing persons, *οι αγνοούμενοι* (i agnooumenoi) and *Şehitler* is woven deeply into the post-conflict societal structures.⁷ In Greek-Cypriot society, the term ‘agnooumenoi’ (meaning ‘The Missing’) has come to be a collective term for the Greek Cypriots who went missing as a result of the 1974 Turkish incursion. In Turkish-Cypriot society, the term ‘Şehitler’ (meaning ‘Martyrs’) has come to be a collective term for Turkish Cypriots who went missing or were killed as a result of Greek-Cypriot attacks in the decade between 1964 and 1974.

In Greek-Cypriot society, the agnooumenoi⁸ provide a legitimated means of emphasising Turkish barbarism. In so doing, they also often serve to create a contrasting memory to the country’s post-conflict partition; that of peace and bi-communalism, which was disrupted by the brutal Turkish invasion.⁹ Because of their central role in the conflict’s conceptualisation, developments in the agnooumenoi issue have the potential to reshape the enduring Greek-Cypriot memory of the conflict, and therefore also may affect their perception of the conflict itself.

Calls to the UN for information about the whereabouts of Greek Cypriots who had disappeared in 1974 began almost immediately. In 1981, the issue was handed over to an investigative commission called the Committee for Missing Persons. Both the issue and the organisation itself are highly political, and significantly politicised. The CMP’s powers are effectively weakened by both the Greek- and Turkish-Cypriot administrations. The CMP’s mandate from the UN has been to establish the deaths of the missing, and has quite pointedly avoided examining the cause of those deaths.¹⁰ Until recently, neither side has welcomed the political consequences attached to exhumation of these remains, and the CMP has consequently been in a state of stalemate for twenty years. However, since late 2003 there has been significant impetus on the part of both leaderships to resolve the issue.¹¹

Sant Cassia has argued that there are three important social categories in Greek-Cypriot society which were created by, and therefore are inextricably linked to, the Turkish invasion: the refugees; the enclaved; and the missing people.¹² Those categorised as refugees are Greek Cypriots who were internally displaced as a result of the 1974 Turkish invasion, which was concentrated in the northern half of the country. The enclaved are Greek and Maronite Cypriots who were caught in particular areas of the 1974 war-zone, and who subsequently did not flee south. They have since become enclaved communities, based mostly in the north-eastern

villages in and surrounding Karpasia/Karpaz. They came to symbolise a living, and suffering, link for Greek Cypriots with the parts of Cyprus rendered inaccessible. One may also develop Sant Cassia's idea further, to argue that these three categories (the missing, the enclaved, and the refugees) together constitute the Greek-Cypriot face of the Cyprus conflict in a powerful prism of images.

While the Turkish-Cypriot leadership decisively declared all the Turkish-Cypriot missing to be dead, in the south, few of the Greek-Cypriot missing have been so declared. Instead, they remain missing and therefore possibly alive.¹³ Common wisdom holds that the fate of the agnooumenoi rests in the hands of Turkey, and more specifically in the hands of those who engineered and led the 1974 Turkish military incursion into Cyprus.¹⁴ Believing that Turkey holds the answers about the fates of Greek-Cypriot missing people, the Republic of Cyprus government and a number of lobby groups claiming to represent the families of the missing¹⁵ have used international platforms to pressure the Turkish government into releasing circumstantial details of their loved ones' disappearances.¹⁶ But Turkey does not respond to such petitions and requests for information, and much to the chagrin of the Republic of Cyprus, the CMP's mandate is limited to investigations within Cyprus; obtaining information from Turkish sources remains outside its jurisdiction.

The unresolved nature of the case has allowed numerous Greek-Cypriot governments to chastise Turkey in international forums, linking human rights and Turkish violence in Cyprus to a number of other Turkish human rights violations in Turkey and surrounding areas. Because of the issue's open-ended nature, a conclusion has been drawn in Greek-Cypriot society that while the conflict remains, there will be no answers about the fate of their agnooumenoi.¹⁷ The lingering air of unresolvability of the missing has also served the domestic function of reminding the public that the conflict is not over, and perpetuating the concept of Greek-Cypriot victimhood.¹⁸

Because of this belief, and because of the taboo surrounding the idea that the agnooumenoi might be dead, the missing persons have become "metaphors for return";¹⁹ strongly intertwined with the desire for return of the land taken in the 1974 invasion, for return to a time before the Turkish invasion and subsequent occupation of north Cyprus which caused such humiliation to Greek-Cypriot national pride.²⁰ The ethereal absence of bodies, and the nature of their disappearance, has come to mirror the 'missing' part of Cyprus, the fate of which also rests in Turkish hands. The absence of bodies represents a societal inability to mourn a gap which must be filled to be overcome.

The absence of bodies has also come to symbolise the conflict's unresolved nature. Hope for the return of the agnooumenoi represents the Greek-Cypriot hope for the eventual reunification of "a split land".²¹

“The campaign to keep the issue, and hence the agnooumeni, alive risks preventing healing and therapy, and channels aggression outwards towards the Turks. Such a sustained ... campaign may be due to the risk that a public acceptance of the probabilities of their deaths could symbolically represent an acknowledgement that the North has been lost forever.”²²

This opinion seems to be supported by recent statements made by previous Republic of Cyprus president Tassos Papadopoulos, who linked the fact that “nothing had really changed ‘on the ground’ in the past 30 years”²³ with “severe violations of fundamental human rights [which] still existed as a result of the invasion such as the unresolved problem of the missing persons...”.²⁴ The emphasis here is that nothing has changed; Turkey has still to answer for the missing in Cyprus as it has still to withdraw from the occupied territory. Similarly, in July 2004 relatives of the agnooumeni commemorated the 30-year anniversary of the Turkish incursion with a protest outside Ledra Palace checkpoint in divided Nicosia. The protest was organised by the Pancypriot Anti-occupation Movement, whose president²⁵ explicitly linked the idea of a Turkish withdrawal from occupied Cyprus with knowledge about the fate of the missing. He argued that Greek Cypriots who cross to the north (using the Ledra Palace checkpoint) “have conceded to being tourists in their own homeland”,²⁶ reminding them that “these mothers dressed in black have been waiting thirty years now for any positive information about their husbands, children and brothers, and we want to send the message that their human rights are cruelly being violated”.²⁷

The way the agnooumeni issue has been framed is also structurally supportive of the Greek-Cypriot conceptualisation of the Cyprus conflict’s history. Beyond the idea that the agnooumeni were captured by Turkish soldiers, there is little public discussion or acknowledgement of other, more problematic, explanations of how the missing disappeared. The work of recent researchers has shown that a considerable proportion of the Greek-Cypriot missing are thought to have been killed by Turkish-Cypriot paramilitaries or civilians.²⁸ But to place blame for Greek-Cypriot disappearances with Turkish Cypriots is to undermine the official Greek-Cypriot telling of Cypriot modern history, where Greek and Turkish Cypriots lived like brothers, whose tranquil lives and friendships were destroyed by the bloody and unnecessary Turkish invasion.²⁹ To admit that there were inter-communal killings is to run the risk of supporting the Turkish-Cypriot claim that their political independence is necessary because Greek and Turkish Cypriots cannot live peacefully together. In addition, an unknown number of Greek Cypriots were killed in intra-communal skirmishes during the Greek coup which triggered the subsequent Turkish military intervention.³⁰ However, none of these alternative narratives are given real voice.

Instead, the agnooumenoi contribute to the Greek-Cypriot telling of history that centres on the tension between (Greek) Cyprus and Turkey. The past is a story of Turkish aggression and Cypriot (both Greek and Turkish) victimhood. While it has recently come to light that Greek-Cypriot authorities have known that a number of the agnooumenoi were dead and buried at a military cemetery in south Cyprus, they have continued to maintain the fiction that Turkey holds the only answers about the men's deaths; that the bodies are unrecoverable solely because of Turkish intransigence.

"Occupation of Cyprus by Turkey, her violation of the rights of the relatives to be united with their loved ones, heroism and sacrifice, loss and a whole complex of social emotions. When the [Greek Cypriot] authorities held onto information that some of the Missing were in fact buried in the Greek side, they were in effect maintaining not just a fiction, but still retaining their investment in the power of the Signifier (that there are people who are missing), and insinuating the fiction that everybody was still unrecoverable, because of 'Turkish intransigence'."³¹

The nuance is important here. While the Turkish army may well be the cause of death for the vast number of Greek-Cypriot agnooumenoi, the fact that these men are still being promoted as missing, fate unknown, is a fiction. The cases of Pashas and Palmas are so important exactly because they seek to decisively establish government culpability in the perpetuation of such a fiction.

To speak of the agnooumenoi is to legitimate and highlight pain suffered at the hands of Turkish barbarism, and to remember a time before the invasion, when families were united and the country was unified. Any change to the fate of the agnooumenoi, or to the lens through which their absence is viewed, therefore has the potential to damage the Greek-Cypriot perception of the past, upon which the community's imagining of the future is based. Any change in the situation, or the 'facts' upon which the situation is built, is likely to affect the representative Greek-Cypriot conceptualisation of the conflict.

It should be noted that while the way the CMP's progress has affected narratives in the north is not the focus of this study, the changing Turkish-Cypriot narrative regarding the missing people will also affect the Greek-Cypriot narrative, and vice versa. The response in the north to the exhumation has been markedly different, and much more vocal, to that in the south. There has been an open discussion in the Turkish-Cypriot community about whether the bones of their loved ones should be removed from their original burial places and re-buried in the north. Because many of the families of the Turkish-Cypriot missing people knew both that their loved ones were dead, and how they had died, the exhumation process re-awakened particularly painful events and memories that families had long fought to overcome. The effect of the CMP's work and the subsequent burials of the Şehitler

have therefore predominantly been to open old wounds.³² As a corollary, there has been an increase in the symbols of conflict. This difference between the meaning and interpretation attached by each community to the CMP's work, as well as the symbols of war and memories of the conflict that will be revived in each community by the exhumations and burials, will also affect the communal narrative in both societies. Each society's re-conceptualisation of the missing persons issue will necessarily affect the other.³³

Recent Developments in the Missing Persons Situation

As previously highlighted, there are a number of factors driving the resolution of the missing persons' issue. The cases of Pashas and Palmas in the Republic of Cyprus' domestic court, cases in the ECHR which have increased pressure on the Republic of Turkey to act on its human rights record, and internal grassroots pressure for action, have been catalytic factors in the CMP's recent progress. And as a result of both this progress and the events themselves, a change to the image of the agnooumenoi issue in south Cyprus is foreseen and explored in this article.

The CMP has recently made considerable progress, exhuming 399 bodies, and identifying and returning 84³⁴ to families for burial.³⁵ Approximately two-thirds have been Greek-Cypriot. In light of the Greek-Cypriot community's turn towards introspective self-protection in the post-Annan environment, it is interesting that these developments have only occurred in the wake of the failed 2004 peace proposal, though the Clerides government had made two attempts at resolving the situation in 1999 and 2001.³⁶

The CMP's project has been divided into four stages,³⁷ with phase IV ('Return of Remains') bearing the most significance for the families of the missing people. Although some progress was made by the CMP during the Annan plan's development, the beginning of phase IV was only announced in August 2006.³⁸ Significant preparatory work to launch this phase had, however, begun as early as 2004,³⁹ and the CMP's third member (the UN representative) was appointed in June 2006.⁴⁰

It is interesting to note that, despite its sensitivity, the issue of the missing persons in Cyprus has been the only aspect of the conflict to move significantly towards positive resolution since the Annan plan's 2004 rejection. In mid-2006 the third CMP member remarked on the committee's progress:

"The committee is still moving forward. And how come this is the only issue on the island that is moving forward is a good question, I don't know why. Because it could be stuck like the rest. But it is not. And ... [although] both sides have their own reasons to solve it ... for the time being we are surfing on this goodwill."⁴¹

His comment highlights that pressure to solve the missing persons issue is coming from a number of areas.⁴² Three reasons can be offered to explain why the political will exists to confront this controversial subject. In 2001, in the Fourth Inter-State Application of the Republic of Cyprus against the Republic of Turkey, the ECHR ruled that Turkey's failure to investigate the fate of Greek Cypriots who disappeared as a result of the 1974 war was a violation of Articles 2 and 5 of the Convention.⁴³ On 7 June 2005, the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers adopted an interim resolution regarding the 2001 ruling. The resolution stressed the need for Turkey to intensify its efforts to comply with the judgement's execution, and decided to supervise progress on the issue. As a result, Turkey has had to report regularly to the Committee on its progress. However, Turkey has also been able to use its progress on the issue to emphasise to Brussels its efforts to meet EU standards.⁴⁴ In other words, sufficient incentives have finally been created for Turkey to support progress on the missing persons' issue.

While, on the Turkish side, it is difficult to ascertain whether resolving the missing persons' cases have been impeded by the then-Denktaş 'TRNC' government or the Turkish authorities themselves (or both parties), the state in the north is categorised under international law as a 'subordinate power' to the Turkish Republic. The European Court of Human Rights has therefore placed legal responsibility for the continuing silence regarding particular missing persons cases (Varnavas a.o. v. Turkey is the most recent example) with the Turkish government, rather than with the 'TRNC' authorities.

Turkey's need to comply with certain EU standards and decisions in order to keep on its accession path has therefore had a positive impact on the missing persons issue by its increased co-operation. Its willingness to co-operate has also had a subtle effect on the agnooumenoi's public persona; it has been more difficult for the Republic of Cyprus government to blame lack of CMP progress on Turkish intransigence if that intransigence has been diluted.

The second reason comes from grassroots pressure, and affects both Greek- and Turkish-Cypriot elite attitudes to the issue. After the checkpoints opened in 2003,⁴⁵ Turkish- and Greek-Cypriot relatives of missing persons began crossing to the other side, desperately conducting private investigations into the fate of their missing loved ones. Lawyer for the Pashas family, Achilleas Demetriades, highlighted how such behaviour has pressured both Greek- and Turkish-Cypriot administrations to act:

"I also think that because people can go across [between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot 'sides'] now it has expedited the matter. I mean, people have been going around looking for bones. This is outrageous! It's crazy that in

2005, in 2006, in 2007, families are actually digging on their own, looking for bones. But it is happening. And since it is happening it means the demand is there, and I think ... [that both the Greek and Turkish Cypriot authorities] had a problem restraining it ..."⁴⁶

Additional pressure has come from the work of Turkish- and Greek-Cypriot journalists Sevgül Uludağ and Andreas Paraschos, and Greek-Cypriot filmmaker Tony Angastiniotis, publicising and gathering information on a number of individual cases of missing people. Uludağ's many articles in the Turkish-Cypriot daily *Yenidüzen* culminated in the publication of her 2005 book *Oysters with the Missing Pearls*, outlining the stories surrounding hundreds of the missing people from both communities. Her work has increased awareness of the reality of the events which led to so many disappearances and murders. In addition, in 2005, Tony Angastiniotis made a documentary about Greek-Cypriot mass murders of Turkish Cypriots in the villages of Muratağa (Maratha), Sandallar (Sandallaris), and Atlılar (Aloa) in July 1974. Angastiniotis' documentary was designed to break the popular notion that Greek Cypriots were the only victims of murders in the 1974 period, and therefore to dent the Greek-Cypriot monologue about who was to blame for the division of Cyprus.⁴⁷ While the documentary received international critical acclaim, it has reached a very limited Greek-Cypriot audience. However, each voice has added to the growing public awareness that the missing persons issue is not as mono-tonal as originally portrayed.

Paraschos has also been important in uncovering Greek-Cypriot government myths about the agnooumenoi. Since 1975, a number of missing persons' widows have been claiming that their husbands were not missing, but had been killed in action and their bodies buried by Greek soldiers in a military cemetery in Lakatamia, in the Greek-Cypriot-controlled part of Cyprus. However, successive governments had denied this claim. In 1995, Paraschos began publicly pushing the Republic of Cyprus government to exhume the bodies of 'soldiers and unknown civilians' that lay in the Lakatamia cemetery. His voice lent strength to the pleas of Androulla Palma and Maroulla Shamishi, wives of agnooumenoi who had come to believe that their husbands had been killed during the war and buried in the Lakadamia cemetery before being identified,⁴⁸ and by 1999 the government began (but then stopped) exhumations of the graves. When, in 2002, the Republic of Cyprus government finally agreed to exhume the relevant plots in the Lakatamia cemetery, the bodies of 46 men on the missing persons list were positively identified.

Included in this group were two particular men, Christofis Pashas and Charalambos Palmas. Shortly after, the families of Pashas and Palmas launched separate cases against the Republic of Cyprus in the state's Civil Court alleging a breach of human rights and negligence. An adviser to the Greek-Cypriot CMP

member supported the claims of the men's families that in 1974 "almost all of 70 war dead interred in unmarked graves at a cemetery in the Nicosia suburb of Lakatamia had documents buried with them that could have confirmed their identity."⁴⁹ The families claim that, had state authorities been more diligent in carrying out a proper investigation, the fates of Pashas, Palmas, and 44 other men listed as agnooumeonoi would have been known, and their families spared decades of unnecessary suffering.

The cases are of particular importance to the Greek-Cypriot portrayal of the agnooumenoi. The Palmas family "claims that the government deliberately misinformed them about Charalambos' fate, instead building up the cult of the missing for political currency abroad ... demanding £1 million in compensation for a generation of what they term psychological trauma and inhuman treatment at the hands of the Republic."⁵⁰ The state's "defence rests on the premise that lack of progress in resolving the drawn-out humanitarian issue was owed primarily to the Turkish side's refusal to cooperate."⁵¹ If the families win their case, the state's argument that Turkey is to blame for the issue's continuation will be significantly damaged. This possibility, and the threat of more such embarrassing cases may have contributed to steeling the Greek-Cypriot elite's will to finally confronting the agnooumenoi issue.

Support from the Greek-Cypriot authorities is therefore the final factor explaining the CMP's productivity. Perhaps as a result of the above elements, the Republic of Cyprus authorities have in the post-Annan period been offering quiet but consistent high-level support for the CMP's work. This perspective is supported by CMP third member Christophe Girod, who recently reaffirmed that "politically the support is still here, from both communities. From both leaderships. And so far so good in terms of political will to move forward."⁵²

The support of Greek-Cypriot political elites is important; they play a central role in shaping the agnooumenoi issue, and how it is publicly perceived. Therefore, if they stop publicly blaming the Turkish government for perpetuation of the agnooumenoi issue, and at the same time move towards solving the issue, this has a number of consequences for the Greek-Cypriot conceptualisation of both the agnooumenoi issue and the broader Cyprus conflict. Any changes in elite rhetoric directly affect the 'retelling' of the agnooumenoi story in the public sphere, and also has flow-on effects for how the Cyprus conflict is 'lived' in public.

Consequences of these Developments on the Public Persona of 'The Agnooumenoi'

Progress in each of these areas will have a number of consequences, and there will certainly be a cumulative effect on the public face of the agnooumenoi monolith.

Regardless, the cases of Pashas and Palmas, the investigative work of journalists, the continual return of remains to families, as well as a quietening in the government rhetoric against Turkey's role in the missing persons issue have already begun to re-shape the issue. The cases of Pashas and Palmas, as well as the work of Uludağ and Paraschos have encouraged an embryonic debate that has begun to question long-held beliefs about the missing persons issue, and consequently, about how to understand the Cyprus conflict. But, at the same time, the debate is very tentative. This hesitancy has been highlighted by Stefanos Evripidou in a recent news article:

“People are still afraid to talk of the dead or of the massacres perpetrated. There is fear that talk will open a Pandora's Box of blood, violence and revenge. What happened in the 1960s? What happened in 1974? Apart from the invading army, what crimes did Cypriots commit that have gone unpunished? These questions remain unanswered. Among Greek Cypriots, any talk of illegal killings is hidden behind great acts of heroism ...”⁵³

It is clear that while the topic cannot but be affected by the recent developments outlined in this paper, it is an area heavy with inertia.

The case which most clearly reinforces the traditional role of the agnooumenoi in the Cyprus conflict is that of Varnavas a.o. v. Turkey in the ECHR. In January 2008, the court found Turkey guilty of continuing to violate articles 2, 3, and 5 of the European Convention on Human Rights.⁵⁴ The court's comments on the violations of articles 2 and 5 can be considered strongly supportive of Greek-Cypriot claims that Turkey must be made to explain the fate of the agnooumenoi, and that the CMP's mandate is insufficient. Article 2 addresses the right to life, “concerning Turkey's failure to conduct an effective investigation into the whereabouts and fate of nine of the applicants, who disappeared in life-threatening circumstances”.⁵⁵ Article 5 protects the right to liberty and security, and the court reiterates its comment on Turkey's failure to conduct an effective investigation into the fate of the nine men, “concerning whom there was an arguable claim that they had been deprived of their liberty at the time of their disappearance”.⁵⁶ How the Varnavas a.o. v. Turkey decision will be used in the Greek-Cypriot political arena, and whether it will be used to push for an expansion of the CMP's mandate towards Turkish co-operation, will be telling of the domestic political climate in Cyprus regarding elite attitudes towards both the resolution of the missing persons issue and of the broader Cyprus conflict.

The case, which reasserts the (very real) victimhood of Greek Cypriots, may also have the effect of soothing an image which, I have argued, is being quietly re-shaped by the recent developments outlined above. There is also the possibility that, should the civil court find in favour of Pashas and Palmas, the ECHR's findings against Turkey in Varnavas a.o. v. Turkey may mute any public backlash against the government. The government may also be able to use the ECHR findings to defend

its position that the main impediment to resolution of the agnooumenoi issue has been the Turkish government's refusal to co-operate.

The cases of Pashas and Palmas hold the most interesting possibilities for the future of the agnooumenoi's persona in the Greek-Cypriot imagining. The cases mark two of the few public rebellions against the official imagery by Greek Cypriots who personify part of the struggle against the Turkish occupation. They are particularly brave moves, made in a daunting political climate, where opposition to government policies on any topics related to the Cyprus conflict have been perceived as borderline treason. Discourse analysis on the Pashas case shows a muted, or bewildered, domestic public reaction to the family's accusations.⁵⁷ However, the court's decisions about both cases (a ruling on the Pashas case is due this year) have the potential to open a debate on the (mis)use of the agnooumenoi in the diplomatic war against Turkey. Should the court find the state guilty of negligence, the public reaction will be interesting. Should the court's findings support the state's claims, the cases are likely to progress to the ECHR, lending them more importance.

The 2008 election to power of historically pro-reconciliation party AKEL in the Republic of Cyprus has created a unique possibility regarding the consequences and impact of these cases. It may be that the new AKEL majority government would seek to use any decisions in favour of the plaintiffs as an opportunity to break with the past. Distancing itself from previous government policies on the missing peoples may be an effective means of underlining its desire to make progress on the general issue of reunification. If the court finds against the government, the election of AKEL to the presidency may also serve to soften, or decrease the likelihood of, any public backlash against the government on such a sensitive topic.

But the factor with the most potential to influence Greek-Cypriot conceptualisation of the agnooumenoi issue must be the CMP's continuous unearthing and returning of remains. There are many levels on which the committee's work is important. At the primary level, bodies are constantly being found, and funerals are being regularly held for victims of the conflict. This means that the issue's departure from the decades-long status quo is continuously in the public consciousness, no matter how cautiously the re-burials are being reported.

At another level, the return of bodies has been fraught with a quiet tension. Before the CMP began returning remains to families in 2007, its representatives privately feared that relatives, finding evidence that their loved ones were summarily executed, would seek retributive justice.⁵⁸ While conveying understanding of the need for justice, the lack of trust and understanding between the communities was highlighted. The members feared that post-referendum

tension might be further exacerbated by inter-communal accusations of war crimes and mass murders.⁵⁹ When the members were interviewed again in late 2007 and early 2008, they were asked about the overwhelming public silence which has surrounded the return of remains in both communities. They replied that:

“When we returned the first bodies last summer, we expected that one side or the other would publish a photo of a skull with a bullet, because there are some skulls like that, summary executions ... we were expecting the pictures to be published on the front page of the newspaper, you know, saying ‘look at what the other side has done to us’, but it hasn’t been the case, which has been surprising. Politically surprising because it shows maturity and also awareness that they might affect the process, and what about the other families [who] will suffer [if the process is halted] ...”⁶⁰

The lack of strong media response to the recent burials⁶¹ supports the CMP member’s comments, and seems to reflect the recent, quiet, political support for resolution of the issue. Some central actors believe the quiet surrounding the missing persons issue is advantageous. Journalist Uludağ supports the topic’s muted treatment in the public media.

“If we start a discussion about murderers at this very moment, we will most probably be damaging the work of the Cyprus Missing Persons Committee as well as our work as journalists to locate mass graves. We are still trying to locate mass graves ... going after the murderers at this moment might turn out to be ‘sensational work for some media’ that will not serve either finding mass graves or reconciliation”.⁶²

However, while the CMP’s mandate remains so limited, there is the very real possibility that some of the agnooumenoi’s families will seek retributive justice elsewhere. Within Cyprus, there is no means for people to learn how their loved ones died, or at whose hand, and the ECHR is becoming increasingly attractive as an option. But while the Varnavas a.o. v. Turkey decision has emphasised the CMP’s limitations, few will be able to seek retributive justice in Strasbourg; cases are time-barred, which means that a relative must apply to the court within six months of receiving the bones or else their case cannot be accepted.

While the debate is currently very cautious, there is room to expect more dynamism on the subject in the future. The limitations outlined above have the potential to mobilise the families of the missing, which could channel enough public pressure to begin calls for domestic remedies such as truth commissions and the like. In addition, the new government may be more willing to explore such options, especially given that a number of AKEL supporters and members were killed during intra-communal battles both before and during the Turkish invasion. This means

that AKEL may have more motivation than previous governments to deconstruct the rhetoric which uses the agnooumenoi to ensure continued domestic support for continued struggle against the Turkish invasion.

Broader Implications for the Cyprus Conflict

This paper has highlighted three events (the recent sustained progress of the CMP; the cases of Pashas and Palmas in the Republic of Cyprus' civil courts; and the case of Varnavas a.o. v. Turkey in the ECHR) and has pointed out an as-yet unacknowledged fact: that each of these events will impact on the future of the agnooumenoi persona in Greek-Cypriot society. If we are to agree with Sant Cassia's idea that the agnooumenoi provide a vehicle for Greek-Cypriot society to conceptualise and talk about the past and the future,⁶³ then we must acknowledge that these events have the capacity to deeply impact Greek-Cypriot society. However, the fact that these events are still developing has required this paper to be largely exploratory and therefore unavoidably speculative. As the CMP's work moves more deeply into the public consciousness, the cases of Pashas and Palmas are decided, and the implications of Varnavas a.o. v. Turkey are clearer, their impact will be more fully understood, and more easily measurable.

The study's initial prediction is that the events explored above have begun to crack the mono-tonal, monolithic façade of the missing persons' issue. It was further hypothesised at the beginning of this study that because of the issue's importance in the Greek-Cypriot imagining of the Cyprus conflict, any fracture to this façade will have to be construed as a threat to the public persona of the Cyprus conflict more broadly, and therefore that any Republic of Cyprus government which seeks to preserve the (domestic and international) image of the Cyprus conflict will also seek to paper over any fractures which arise in the missing persons issue.

However, quite interestingly, the second part of this prediction seems so far not to be the case. This may signal that the implications of these events are still being processed by the Greek-Cypriot authorities. However, it may also signal a quiet turn in both the official and societal conceptualisation of the agnooumenoi's role in the broader Cyprus conflict. If the enduring quiet continues alongside resolution of the missing persons' issue, perhaps one may conclude that the agnooumenoi are no longer required to represent the Cyprus conflict in quite the same way. In any case, these events have destabilised the essentialised image of the agnooumenoi and their relationship with the Cyprus conflict.

Notes

1. While there are also Greek Cypriots who went missing in 1963/4, they are not included in the Republic of Cyprus' official missing persons list.
2. The Annan plan was a federal and consociational blueprint for the government of Cyprus completed in March 2004 under the auspices of the UN and put to the Greek- and Turkish-Cypriot people in separate referendums on 25 April 2004. It was designed to reunify the country prior to the admission of Cyprus to the European Union, which was to occur on 1 May 2004. The plan was rejected in the 2004 referendum by a 76 per cent majority of the Greek-Cypriot population; and approved by a majority of 65 per cent of the Turkish-Cypriot population. Without the approval of a majority of both ethnic groups the plan could not be adopted.
3. Sant Cassia, P. (2005) *Bodies of Evidence: Burial, Memory and the Recovery of Missing Persons in Cyprus*. New York, Berghahn Books, p. 22.
4. See footnote 6.
5. ECHR application no's. 16064/90, 16065/90, 16066/90, 16068/90, 16069/90, 16070/90, 16071/90, 16072/90, and 16073/90.
6. For the strongest of these, see Sant Cassia, P. (2005) *Bodies of Evidence: Burial, Memory and the Recovery of Missing Persons in Cyprus*; Sant Cassia, P. (2006) 'Guarding Each Other's Dead, Mourning One's Own: The Problem of Missing Persons and Missing Past in Cyprus', *South European Society and Politics*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 111-128; Papadakis, Y. (2005) *Echoes from the Dead Zone*, London, IB Tauris; Roussou, M. (1986) 'War in Cyprus: Patriarchy and the Penelope Myth', in Ridd, R., and Callway, H. (eds.), *Caught Up in Conflict. Women's Responses to Political Strife*, Basingstoke, Macmillan; Loizos, P. (1981) *The Heart Grown Bitter: A Chronicle of Cypriot War Refugees*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press; Δρουσιώτης Μ. (2000) *1619 Ενοχές, Τα Λάθη τα Ψέματα και οι Σκοπιμότητες*, Λευκωσία, Εκδόσεις Διαφάνεια [Drousiotis, M. (2000) *1619 Sins*, Nicosia, Diaphania Press].
7. While families of the missing people have been used by politicians for political gain, it is not the purpose of this work to explain the web of relationships, networks, interests and psychologies which have contributed to building the missing persons juggernaut. Sant Cassia has produced a magisterial work on the topic in his recent book, *Bodies of Evidence* (cited above).
8. The two terms 'missing persons' and 'agnooumenoi' each hold different meanings in this paper. The term 'agnooumenoi' is used in this paper to represent Greek-Cypriot missing persons, and to the Greek-Cypriot articulation of the missing persons' issue, while the term 'missing persons' is used to refer to the missing persons issue, or the people, as an inclusive whole.
9. Bryant, R. (2004) *Imagining the Modern, the Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*, London, IB Tauris and Co., p. 243.
10. Interestingly, then-Attorney General of the Republic of Cyprus Michalis Triantafyllides made a formal decision to override the state's legal obligation, upon the discovery of human bones, to undertake a criminal investigation. The policy implemented was

designed to encourage people to come forward with information about deaths related to 1974 in exchange for immunity from prosecution. This decision supports both the general attitude regarding discovery of the missing people in Cyprus, and the CMP's mandate, of focusing purely on discovery of the fate of the missing people.

11. Yakinthou, C. (2007) 'Between Scylla and Charybdis: Cyprus and the Problem of Engineering Political Settlements for Divided Societies', University of Western Australia, Unpublished PhD manuscript, p. 170.
12. Sant Cassia, P. (2005) *Bodies of Evidence: Burial, Memory and the Recovery of Missing Persons in Cyprus*, p. 71.
13. This has created a number of complications. Because the Greek-Cypriot missing people have not been declared dead, their estates are not inheritable by law but protected by a custodian, and in order to re-marry, the widows of missing persons have had to divorce their missing husbands first. Effectively, the lives of their families have been frozen in time.
14. Bryant, R. (2004) *Imagining the Modern, the Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*, pp. 241-243.
15. Especially the 'Pancyprian Committee of the Relatives of the Missing Persons', and the 'Organisation of Relatives of Missing Cypriots'.
16. See for example [<http://kypros.org/CyprusPan/cyprus/missing.html>]; [<http://www.missing-cy.org>] and [<http://agrino.org/humrights/>].
17. In the broader context of the Cyprus conflict, other court cases, especially those relating to Greek and Turkish property in the European Court of Human Rights and in the Republic of Cyprus' domestic courts, as well as progress being made on the Turkish-Cypriot property commission will also play a role in the public perception of the missing people. However, the impact these and other cases will have on the missing persons issue is necessarily outside of this paper's field of examination. This is an under-explored area which is developing quite quickly. A further article exploring the broader relationship between the property issue and developments in the missing persons' persona in both Cypriot communities would be useful. In addition, an article exploring both Greek- and Turkish-Cypriot reactions to the CMP's progress and related court cases, as well as the way that the changing narratives in both communities are interrelated is being planned by the author.
18. Old wounds are opened from time to time, bringing with them a bitter reminder to Greek Cypriots of their victimhood, and the danger that still emanates from Turkey. In 2007, for example, a story was circulated by a Greek-Cypriot journalist based in the United States that there was evidence to support an old claim that a young boy listed as injured in 1974 was taken to Adana, Turkey after treatment in Cyprus. It was speculated that the boy was raised, unknowingly, as a Turk. Hopes of the boy's family were raised and then dashed when nothing came of the assertion, but it was enough to rekindle Greek-Cypriot public anxiety about the conflict. Shortly after, a similar story arose from a Greek-Cypriot mother who had heard that her missing son might have been raised by a Turkish-Cypriot woman whose husband was a Turkish army officer. For further details see Elias Hazou, 'I Know my Son is Alive', *Cyprus Mail*, 20 March 2007; Alexia Saoulli, 'Clerides: Denktas Never Told Me the Child was Dead', *Cyprus Mail*, 7 March 2007.

19. Sant Cassia, P. (2005) *Bodies of Evidence: Burial, Memory and the Recovery of Missing Persons in Cyprus*, p. 79.
20. For the relationship between the Turkish occupation and Greek national pride, see Papadakis, Y. (2003) 'Nation, Narrative and Commemoration: Political Ritual in Divided Cyprus', *History and Anthropology*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 253-270, and Papadakis, Y. 'Nationalist Imaginings of War in Cyprus', [<http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/Papadakis%20-%20nationalism.htm>], accessed 16 December 2007.
21. Sant Cassia, P. (2005) *Bodies of Evidence: Burial, Memory and the Recovery of Missing Persons in Cyprus*, p. 81.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
23. Jean Christou, 'Invasion and Occupation still Core Issues', *Cyprus Mail*, 24 September 2004.
24. *Ibid.*
25. Aris Hadjipanayiotou.
26. 'Still Mourning After 30 Years', *Cyprus Mail*, 20 July 2004.
27. *Ibid.*
28. See especially Uludağ, S. (2006) 'Oysters with the Missing Pearls, Nicosia, Bilban and IKME, and Andreas Paraskos' articles in Greek-language *Politis* newspaper.
29. For a summary of Greek-Cypriot historiography, see Papadakis, Y. (1995) 'The Politics of Memory and Forgetting' (Chapter from doctoral dissertation), [<http://www.cyprus-conflict.net/papadakis-diss%20-pt2.htm>], accessed 12 February 2008.
30. The idea that any Greek Cypriot on the official missing persons' list could have been killed during the coup is a significant taboo in Greek-Cypriot society. In part, this is due to the shame that surrounds the coup – which precipitated the Turkish invasion and occupation of Cyprus – and the idea that Greek Cypriots were killing each other, as well as strong unwillingness to persecute those involved in the coup. But it is also a taboo subject because in the face of Greek-Cypriot calls for information about the agnooumenoi, Turkish-Cypriot officials have frequently claimed that most of the agnooumenoi were not killed by Turks but by Greeks. To acknowledge this idea, then, is to give credit to the Turkish argument, and therefore also discredit their own calls for information from the Turkish government about the fate of the agnooumenoi; it is to play into the enemy's hands. For further analysis and support, see Sant Cassia, P. (2005) *Bodies of Evidence: Burial, Memory and the Recovery of Missing Persons in Cyprus*, esp. pp. 72-73.
31. Sant Cassia, P. (2005) *Bodies of Evidence: Burial, Memory and the Recovery of Missing Persons in Cyprus*, p. 220.
32. Kudret Özersay's letter to Sevgül Uludağ in Turkish-language *Yenidüzen* newspaper highlights the painful process that surrounds the exhumations for families of 'missing' loved ones. In the letter, he outlines his reasons for not wanting the CMP to exhume his father and uncles, who were killed near their village of Alaminos. See [http://www.stwing.upenn.edu/~durduran/hamambocu/authors/svg/svg7_12_2004.html], accessed 4 May 2008.

33. I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for this insight and for the comments upon which this paragraph has been built.
34. As of April 2008.
35. Christophe Girod, CMP third member. Interview with author, 8 January 2008.
36. In 1999 and again in 2001 the Clerides government began unilateral exhumations of Turkish-Cypriot mass graves. See 'Cyprus to Dig up Graves in Check on Missing People', Reuters News, 17 August 1998; 'Republic of Cyprus: Kassolides – Exhumation Process May End the Drama of the Families of Missing', M2 Presswire, 4 June 1999; 'Cyprus Exhumations End, Identification to Start', Reuters News, 12 July 1999; 'Cyprus May Open Turkish Cypriot Graves for Checks', Reuters News, 21 June 2001. However, they stopped when the Turkish-Cypriot administration did not reciprocate the gesture.
37. Phase I: Archaeological Phase
Phase II: Anthropological Phase
Phase III: Genetic Phase
Phase IV: Return of Remains
38. See [www.cmp-cyprus.org].
39. The CMP reconvened on 30 August 2004 after five years of inactivity.
40. Christophe Girod. The CMP is composed of three members: one Greek Cypriot, one Turkish Cypriot, and one UN representative, who is called the 'third member', but who acts unofficially as the committee head.
41. Christophe Girod, CMP third member. Interview with author, 11 October 2006.
42. See figures 1 and 2, appendix 1.
43. ECHR decision, 10 May 2001. Application no. 25781/94.
44. Confidential interview with UN diplomat based in Cyprus.
45. Restrictions on freedom of movement between north and south Cyprus were partially lifted by the 2003 unilateral decision by then-president of the internationally unrecognised 'Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC)', Rauf Denktaş, to open two checkpoints, allowing Turkish and Greek Cypriots to cross to the other side for the first time since 1975.
46. Achilleas Demetriades. Interview with author, 21 December 2007.
47. Private correspondence with author, January 2008.
48. For a deeper study of the Shamishi and Palma cases, see Sant Cassia, P. (2005) *Bodies of Evidence: Burial, Memory and the Recovery of Missing Persons in Cyprus*, and Sant Cassia, P., 'Recognition and Emotion: Exhumations of Missing Persons in Cyprus' in Papadakis et. al., (2006) *Divided Cyprus: Modernity, History and an Island in Conflict*, Indiana, Indiana University Press.
49. 'State "neglected duty" to Look into Missing Evidence', *The Cyprus Weekly*, 7-13 July 2006.
50. 'Family Demands Compensation for Trauma over Missing Person', *Cyprus Mail*, 15 July 2001.
51. 'State "neglected duty" to Look into Missing Evidence', *The Cyprus Weekly*, 7-13 July 2006.

52. Christophe Girod, CMP third member. Interview with author, January 2008.
53. Stefanos Evripidou, 'Burying our Sins along with our Sons', Cyprus Mail, 10 February 2008.
54. On 28 March 2008 Turkey applied for a referral to the Grand Chamber of the ECHR. If Turkey is successful, the case will essentially be re-tried. If not, the judgement will become final.
55. ECHR Press Release issued by the Registrar of chamber judgement in Varnavas a.o. v Turkey.
56. Ibid.
57. Analysis conducted of Greek-language newspapers Politis, and Phileleftheros, as well as English-language daily Cyprus Mail in the period 2005-2008.
58. In confidential interviews with author, October and November 2006.
59. Ibid.
60. In confidential interviews with the author, December 2007 and January 2008.
61. Stories such as the following are representative of the way that burials of the agnooumenoi are treated in the Greek-Cypriot press: 'Mass Graves in North to be Exhumed in Search for Missing', Cyprus Mail, 23 December 2004; Simon Bahcheli, 'Digging in the Wrong Place?', Cyprus Mail, 12 January 2005; Jean Christou, 'We Dumped them in the Well', Cyprus Mail, 14 January 2005; Simon Bahcheli and Michele Kambas, 'Cyprus Families Grieve Missing Loved Ones at Last', Reuters News, 8 July 2007.
62. Sevgül Uludağ, comment in electronic forum 'Reunification in Cyprus Starts with Truth and Reconciliation', in blogged discussion 'Top Lawyer Calls for Truth Commission'. [www.facebook.com/topic.php?uid=22758546720&topic=4274], accessed 20 February 2008.
63. Sant Cassia, P. (2005) Bodies of Evidence: Burial, Memory and the Recovery of Missing Persons in Cyprus, p. 22.

SINGLE-PARENT FAMILIES IN CYPRUS

Nicos Peristianis and Katerina Kokkinou

Abstract

This article utilises the findings of the research programme “Single-Parent Families in Cyprus (2004-2006)”,¹ which attempted to map the phenomenon of Greek-Cypriot single-parent families, focusing on the social, psychological and financial dimensions. Four aspects in particular are highlighted: a) the major changes that Greek-Cypriot families have undergone in the past few decades, b) the phenomenon of single parenthood in Cyprus diachronically, c) the main differences between single-parent families, and other families in Cyprus (the comparisons draw on a wider survey of families in Cyprus, which the authors carried out in 2004), and d) the Cypriot state and its welfare policies as regards single-parent families.

Keywords: single-parent families, families in Cyprus, support network, family roles and responsibilities, welfare system

Introduction

The tendency towards differentiation of the conventional nuclear family and the creation of new forms of family (such as single-parent families) is characteristic of modern western societies, a phenomenon which looks likely to expand in the years to come. Although the percentage of single-parent families in Cyprus is still relatively small (approximately 5% of all households in 2001) it has been increasing rapidly over the past few years.

This article will utilise the findings of the research programme: “Single-Parent Families in Cyprus (2004-2006)”, which attempted to map the phenomenon of Greek-Cypriot single-parent families, focusing on the social, psychological and financial dimensions. Four aspects in particular will be highlighted:

- a. The major changes that the Greek-Cypriot families have undergone in the past few decades,
- b. The phenomenon of single parenthood in Cyprus diachronically,
- c. The main differences between single-parent families, and other families in Cyprus (the comparisons draw on a wider survey of families in Cyprus, which the authors carried out in 2004),

- d. The Cypriot state and its welfare policies with regard to single-parent families; a comparison will be made with other European countries, so as to situate the Cypriot case within a typology of European welfare systems, highlighting the similarities and differences involved.

Recent Trends of Change in Greek-Cypriot Families

Greek-Cypriot society treasures the institution of the family as the centre of cultural existence and regards it as “a very important ‘shelter’ for its members, a ‘port’ that its members can depart from when the time is ripe, but to which they can return when things get rough” (Peristianis et al., 2004). In the past three decades Greek-Cypriot families have undergone radical changes which follow, to a large extent, the relevant global trends while maintaining many of their traditional characteristics.

Family-related behaviour, in Cyprus, has come to display many of the new trends characterising western societies. Some of the major changes are: an increase of the mean age at marriage, an increase in mixed and civic marriages, a higher divorce rate, a low fertility rate, new opportunities given to women, and a greater intimacy between couples as well as in the relations between parents and children. In contrast to trends in the western world, the marriage rate is still increasing, illegitimacy and cohabitation remain at very low levels, and the allocation of responsibilities as regards domestic chores and childrearing still maintains the dominant traditional pattern with women taking most responsibilities.

Statistical data illustrate these changes: In the 1960 Census it was estimated that one woman out of every ten was married before reaching the age of 20, and three out of ten before reaching 25 (Statistical Service, 1963). The mean age at marriage for men was about 26.3 years and for women 23.3 (Demographic Report, 1965). Nowadays, the first marriage is postponed both for men and women. The mean age of men at first marriage increased from 25.7 in the period 1974-1977 to 29.1 in 2005. Similarly, the mean age of women at first marriage increased from 22.9 to 26.7 during the same period (Demographic Report, 2005). Postponed marriage is increasingly preceded by “living-apart-together relations” (couples who have intimate relationships but temporarily live in separate households) or the more traditional cohabitation after engagement, which in fact constitutes a step before marriage. Cohabitation without the prospect of marriage is still a very rare phenomenon because social disapproval remains quite strong. Only a small proportion (3%) of Greek-Cypriots approve of cohabitation of partners with no intention of getting married (Intercollege, 2002, p. 17).

The annual aggregate number of marriages continues to increase. For instance, the total number of marriages of permanent residents in 2005, totalled

5,881, and the crude marriage rate was calculated at 7.8 per thousand population. The number of marriages is still affected by the leap year taboo – that such a year is a bad omen and does not help a marriage to be strong and long-lasting. In the 1960s and 1970s, as in previous years, intermarriage between Christians and other religions was almost non-existent in Cyprus. More than 99% of the Greek Orthodox bridegrooms married Greek Orthodox brides. In addition, more than 90% of marriages and divorces were ecclesiastical, and 95% of all marriages occurring, were among persons who never had married before (Demographic Report, 1965 and 1970). By 2005 ecclesiastical marriages among permanent residents had reduced to 65.8% and civil marriages had increased to 34.2% of the total number of marriages among permanent residents. In most cases of civil marriages the groom was Cypriot and the bride was of foreign nationality (41.4%); in a much smaller (16.2%) number of cases, the bride was Cypriot and the groom was of foreign nationality (Demographic Report, 2005).

The above data illustrates that endogamy is still very high among Greek-Cypriots who choose to be married in church, but is not anymore such a strong criterion among Greek-Cypriots who choose to be married by local mayors (civil marriages). A strong factor accounting for the continuing high numbers of ecclesiastical marriages is family values and traditions: although mate choice is not as strongly influenced by parents as in the past the ‘venue choice’ is, so parents thereby continue to function ‘as transmitters of family traditions’ – if only of more attenuated forms of the latter. The majority of civil marriages involve Greek-Cypriot men and Eastern European women (Demographic Report, 2005); a major reason seems to be that civil marriages are more convenient, since the procedure is quicker and cheaper, offering Eastern European women protection from deportation. Besides, getting married to a non-Cypriot already constitutes a break with tradition, so “perpetrators” seem to find it more consistent to opt for a more modern marriage ceremony venue.

Furthermore, the percentage of persons who have never married is decreasing, whereas at the same time there is an increase in second and third marriages. In 2005, for instance, first marriages for both partners constituted 73.2% of total marriages, 18% were remarriages for one partner, and 8.8% were remarriages for both partners (Demographic Report, 2005). This demonstrates that divorce itself does not seem to weaken the Greek-Cypriots’ faith in marriage as an institution and that those who are unhappy with their spouses and opt for divorce do so in order to look for a new partner and for a new wedding. For Greek-Cypriots marriage is still an institution of primary significance; in a survey for the Formulation of the Demographic Policy 88% of the participants supported that marriage “... is not an outdated institution”, and 81% agreed that people who want children ought to get married (Intercollege, 2002, p. 17).

Postponement of marriage obviously leads to postponement of childbirth and consequently to a low fertility rate. Indeed, the crude birth rate has been falling steadily since the Second World War (Demographic Report, 1970). In 1970 the crude birth rate was computed to be 21.3 per thousand population. By 2005 it had fallen dramatically to 11.1 per thousand population. Socio-economic and cultural factors have been shown to influence this trend: the financial burden of raising children, economic pressures and unemployment, the increasing number of women working outside the home, the desire for a more comfortable life as well as the desire for independence and personal development, fear of the problems in raising children and finally increasing divorce rates have all made their contribution (Intercollege, 2002, p. 16).

Additionally, although there is an increase in pre-marital sexual relations, extra-marital births remain at very low levels. Back in 1965 the Demographic Report suggested that "Illegitimacy has never been a problem in Cyprus and accounts for only 0.1% of all maternities"; this observation seems to continue to be valid today. In 2005, 361 children were born out of wedlock, constituting 4.3%² of the total number of births (Demographic Report, 2005). Although considerably higher than the 1965 figure, this percentage is by far lower than respective percentages in European countries (i.e. UK 42.94%, Sweden 55.45% and Germany 29.18%).³ The constant behind these low figures has been a strong prejudice against illegitimacy, seen to be an indicator of promiscuity – a fact that is not acceptable for Cypriot women, according to the double-standards of local society. Such behaviour is perceived to undermine male power and endanger the institution of the family and the social order itself.

Modern Greek-Cypriot couples seem to have more in common and to have greater intimacy in their relations as compared to traditional couples (Peristianis et al., 2004; Peristianis et al., 2007).⁴ Ironically they also seem to have more conflicts and to find these more difficult to resolve. The Demographic Report of 1970 commented that "the divorce rate per thousand of population was 0.21 and it had remained stable since 1963" (Demographic Report, 1970). However, three decades later this situation is no longer true, since the divorce rate has increased substantially and continues to increase further. By 2005, the crude divorce rate had increased to 2.0 per thousand population. In the same year the total divorce rate (which shows the proportion of marriages that are expected to end in divorce), rose to 233 per thousand marriages, from 42 per thousand in 1980 (Demographic Report, 2005). In the past the divorce rate was retained at a low rate by social, religious and legal restrictions. Like elsewhere in Europe (Popenoe, 1993) a growing number of couples seem to be experiencing divorce nowadays because of changes in the family's traditional economic bonds, the higher expectations for marriages, the reduced influence of religion, and the reduction of the social costs for dissolving a marriage.⁵

Additionally, the vast majority of Greek-Cypriot women confront the problem of having to balance the employment and family responsibilities. The tendency of increased equality in the allocation of the household chores and childrearing, witnessed in other western countries, seems to hold true only in theory in Cyprus. More than 90% of Greek-Cypriot women carry the main responsibility for both household chores and childcare, independent of whether they work or not (Peristianis et al., 2004, pp. 93-97). Greek-Cypriot husbands, following their traditional roles, dedicate themselves almost exclusively to paid employment and act as mere 'assistants' to their wives in the house, not taking any initiative in the completion of chores relating to the house or in the practical care of children of pre-school age.

Nevertheless, both partner and parent-child relations are characterised by several changes in the values that prevail, in the balance of power and decision making, and in the emotional content they may have. While there are still strong inequalities in the allocation of domestic labour, the traditional values concerning the strict hierarchy of gender roles (i.e. the relationship of power-obedience of the mother towards the father) are rejected by the majority of the Greek-Cypriots. Furthermore, despite the fact that fathers still hold the leading position in Cypriot families, the power 'o pateras' used to possess as 'chief' of the family, is much weaker today (Peristianis et al., 2004, pp. 134-138).

In the traditional-patriarchal society the dominant marriage relationship was based on male authority. Weddings were based on pragmatic considerations and focused on such issues as the survival, reputation and consolidation of a family's position in society – and thus the personal happiness of the couple played a secondary role. The inequality between men and women extended throughout every aspect of their social and private lives. Significant changes have, however, occurred in the relationships that have emerged in modern Greek-Cypriot families. Marriages today are less determined by community pressures and values, and there is an emphasis on better interpersonal relations, that are characterised by mutual affection. Marriage is a more flexible institution, which can be used as the royal road towards self-fulfilment. 'Companionship' is a new concept that is seen to characterise modern marriages based on democratic decision-making by the pair.

In the traditional families not only women but children also lacked rights: "Children weren't reared for their own sake but for the satisfaction of the parents" (Giddens, 2002, p. 55). Parents did love their children but they cared more for their contribution to agricultural and household chores, because their constant struggle was the economic survival of the family. A first major push towards a transformation of parent-children relationships came with mass education during the British colonial period: this meant the withdrawal of children from the labour force and gave

rise to a new conception of children and childhood – more akin to an ‘investment for the future’ – rather than as contributors to immediate production needs. Indeed a good education, which for most extends to university level, is considered a must for young Greek-Cypriots and has become a substitute for the traditional dowry institution for those who are poor or a complement to it for the rich. Parent-child relations have equally undergone changes based on children’s needs and sensitivities. Parental authoritative supervision has gradually been transformed into parental guidance, and the blind obedience of children towards their parents to self-development. Contemporary Greek-Cypriot families tend to be overprotective towards their younger members. An illustration of this is the high percentage of young people (54%) between the ages of 18 and 29 years who reside with their parents in the family home until their engagement or marriage⁶ (Peristianis et al., 2007). This may be explained by a number of reasons, such as extended studies, higher affluence which reduces any pressing need for children to work, increasing moral tolerance in the parental home and the high costs of renting and living away from parents, which all contribute to lowering any pressure to leave (for similar developments in Europe, see Galland, 1997 cited by Cliquet, 2003, p. 2).

Children are dissuaded from hard work inside or outside of the house and are encouraged to focus on their self-development. A good education has been transformed into one of the most basic values of the contemporary Greek-Cypriot family. Thus homework is now an important daily family issue, and agonising over grades as well as arguments between parents and children regarding their grades are usual phenomena in Greek-Cypriot households. Greek-Cypriot parents invest much energy and an enormous amount of money in educating their children. “Yet knowledge for the sake of knowledge is not the primary concern” (Markides et al., 1978, p. 150); competition for status seems to be the primary incentive not only for young Cypriots but also for their parents. Parents know that to a great extent their success and social status centres on their children’s ability to complete their studies and secure a ‘good’ job. It is still not uncommon for parents to press their children to follow a particular programme of study, which the children may not want, in order to actualise their own unfulfilled adolescent dreams.

The Phenomenon of Single Parenthood in Cyprus

Single Parenthood in the Past

In the past single parenthood was almost exclusively related to widowhood. **Divorces** were almost non-existent since the practice was strongly forbidden by the strict moral codes of traditional Greek-Cypriot society. However, due to the low social position of women in bygone days, divorced women, and not men, were the ones to be stigmatised and marginalised. In the few cases where a couple “dared” to divorce, the woman was blamed as proof that she was unable to keep her husband and maintain the coherence of the family unit.

The underprivileged position of women, in Cypriot society, is illustrated in the data from the first Census conducted by the British (“Report on the Census of Cyprus, 1881”). As seen in Table 1 the percentage of divorced women (4.9%) was almost fourfold as compared to that of men (1.3%). This is one of the indications that emphasises that following divorce, men are able to continue with a second marriage easier than women. Divorce not only stigmatised parents but also the children of the family, who were regarded as persons of an inferior quality: they brought shame to the community, as they constituted a reminder of their parents’ deviant behaviour, which undermined the ideal type of family.

Table 1: Frequencies and Percentages of Men and Women of Marriage Age, (15+) in 1881⁷

GENDER	MARRIED	WIDOWED	DIVORCED	TOTAL
Men	34,275 (59.4%)	2,822 (4.9%)	78 (1.3%)	37,175
Women	34,050 (60.1%)	9,241 (16.3%)	276 (4.9%)	43,567
Total	68,325	12,063	354	80,742

Widowhood was faced with less harshness than divorce because it was considered to be the result of destiny, and not a conscious and deviant decision. Women, who lost their husbands, usually suffered from deprivation and were in a desperate position as a consequence of their family income decreasing dramatically, to the extent that they were unable to cover the basic needs of their family. The ‘welfare system’ existing in the early twentieth century was in its embryonic stage and thus support from the Cypriot state was non-existent and all social groups suffered associated risks. The family income was, therefore, based on a single-parent’s labour, if they were able to work, or more generally they relied on the support offered by members of their extended family.

The remarriage of a widow depended on the social facts of a specific historical period but especially on the demographic situation on the island. Loizos (1975) has suggested that prior to 1930, women as wives were more scarce than men in the marriage market, and that it was, therefore, possible for widows to remarry; [this became much more difficult after World War II, when men became more scarce]. Despite this, re-marrying did not seem to be as easy for women as it was for men, and many women, therefore, had to remain as single parents and carry the associated stigma for their whole lives. Widows had to dress in black until their death as this was considered proof of respect towards the dead husband and

served as a means of constant remembrance. As shown in Table 1 the percentage of widows was threefold (16.3%) to that of widowers (4.9%) – perhaps an indicator of the difficulties of re-marriage for women.

The basic reasons for the comparatively smaller number of re-marriages of widows were: 1) the relative shortage of men, as compared to women; 2) the traditional behaviour codes by which women abided, meant that they were unable to take the initiative to search for a new husband but had to be patient until a man sought their hand in marriage; 3) the belief that a man who was not the biological father of a girl was a threat to her chastity; 4) the traditional sexual codes whereby men were expected to marry virgin women, and to avoid ‘second-hand’ choices, which were judged of a lower value, and 5) men’s unwillingness to undertake the responsibilities involved in the care of children that were not their biological offspring. In contrast, widowers were supported by the community and usually married within a short time after their wife’s death. This derived from the traditional roles, which determined that childcare and household chores were the responsibility of women, and men therefore needed a woman in the house to take care of their children and the housework.

Unmarried mothers were an even rarer phenomenon – though when it occurred both the mother and the child(ren) were stigmatised for their whole lives, in many cases being rejected by the very members of the woman’s family. Even women who were abandoned by their fiancés or husbands during pregnancy, or women who already had children and had been abandoned, were marginalised by the rest of the community. The label “unmarried mother” was like a curse which a woman carried with her to the grave, her body having born the fruit of “a forbidden pleasure” (Josiane and Riga, 1997), and her actions having disrupted the sacred codes of “honour and shame”. The husband and father, in traditional society, formed the anchor of his wife and children’s identities, hence, unmarried mothers and their children were deemed to be people without bearings, and children were referred to as “the bastards of x” (name of the woman).

Single Parenthood Today

Educational opportunities for young people, and especially for women, increased after the Second World War and particularly after Cyprus’ independence as a result of economic development. Such socioeconomic changes brought about an improvement in the status of women and younger people, and somewhat loosened the dependence of children on parents, and of wives on their husbands. Accordingly, this “emancipation” led to a general restructuring of the power relations within marriage and the family.

The Turkish invasion of 1974 gave rise to even more drastic economic and social changes. One of the negative social consequences was the increase in the

numbers of single parents,⁸ mainly because of the many dead and missing Greek-Cypriots, especially males. A decade after the Turkish invasion (1984) the number of single-parent families with children under 18 years old constituted 5% of the total number of families. The major causes for the increase in lone parenthood were the death of one spouse, missing fathers, divorce, abandonment, and unmarried mothers.


The displacement of one-third of Greek-Cypriots in 1974, and the economic crisis which followed, gave new impetus to the numbers of women entering the labour market, augmenting similar trends which began to appear during the 1960-1974 period. Many of these women provided the cheap labour required to combat the growth in light industries (mostly in the manufacturing of footwear and clothing). The demand for specialised knowledge and skills, especially in the service sector in which women became prominent, meant that a new boost was given to the education of girls. The number of rapes of Greek-Cypriot women during the invasion (European Commission of Human Rights of the Council of Europe, 1976) and the resulting unwanted pregnancies led to a relaxation of the Abortion Law (Vassiliadou, 2002) – an initial small window was to gradually become a wide open door, to the extent that Cyprus is, by default, one of the most liberal countries in the world on the abortions issue.⁹ These developments led to a greater degree of freedom and the independence of women; global developments have also contributed to the weakening of traditional institutions and the further equality of gender. All these changes have set in motion different dynamics that influence individual lives and create new priorities and expectations.

An increasing number of single-parent families is one such change in family structures and dynamics that the twentieth century has witnessed in Western Europe and North America. Although in Cyprus the percentage is small (approximately 5% of all households) it has been increasing rapidly in recent years. This increase is mainly due to an increase in the number of divorces. According to the Census of Population, 2001, the last few decades show a decrease in the number of members per household whereas at the same time there has been an increase in one-person households and in single-parent families.

The majority of both Greek-Cypriot men and women are married (92.7% of women and 96.9% of men), 5.2% of women and 2.7% of men are divorced, 2.1% are widows and 0.4% are widowers.

Graph 1


Family status of the population between the ages 15-49, by gender, 2001



In 2001, the number of Greek-Cypriot single-parents in Cyprus, (between the ages of 15-59) was 9,784: out of these 8,846 (90.4%) were single mothers and 938 (9.6%) were single fathers.

Graph 2


Single-parents in Cyprus between the ages 15-59, by gender, 2001



In the total number of households with couples between 15-59 years of age, who live with their children, lone-parents total 10.6%, and married parents total 89%, whereas cohabitant parents are almost inexistent (0.3%).

Graph 3


Households with couples (15-59 years old) and their resident children, 2001



From the total number of children/young adults (0-24 years old) residing with their parents 6.4% live with one parent, 93.3% live with both their married parents and 0.3% live with their unmarried parents. As regards the total number of the population of children/young adults, 0-24 years of age, 83.3% live with their married parents, 5.7% live with one parent, 0.3% live with their unmarried parents and 10.2% live alone, or are married, or live in different specialised institutions (such as those catering for disabled children).

Graph 4

Children living with their parents between the ages 0-24 years old, 2001



Responsibilities in the Greek-Cypriot Single-parent Family and Support Network


Responsibilities Undertaken in Single-parents' Families in Comparison to "Average" Greek-Cypriot family

One of the most important findings of the research is that single parents – the vast majority of whom are women – are solely and entirely responsible for children (care, emotional support and discipline), as well as housework (cleaning, cooking and washing) and, at the same time they are almost exclusively responsible for the family budget. Seventy-three per cent of the participants said that they managed the family budget because they were the main breadwinners. It is important to note, however, that 22.4% received financial support from elsewhere – 7% identified the extended family as their main source of financial support, with the State taking responsibility for the full support of 12% and the secondary support of a further 5.4%. In addition, there are a few cases (2.3%) where the other parent assumes the main role in the financial support of the single-parent family through alimony payments – indicating that the financial burden is borne by the parent (almost always the women) responsible for the children.

A comparison made between the present research and a study of the "normal" Greek-Cypriot (GC) family (2004),¹⁰ indicates that single parents carry most of the burdens alone, so that parenting and other responsibilities seem overwhelming, crushing the individual.

Graph 5

**Main responsibilities undertaken by single-mothers and mothers in the "normal" GC family
(Comparison between two surveys)**



1.	Main financial contribution
2.	Deciding on large expenses
3.	Deciding on day-to-day expenses
4.	Taking children to private lessons/extra curriculum activities
5.	Helping with children's homework
6.	Deciding whether children will go out at night
7.	Teaching good manners to children
8.	Setting punishments for children
9.	Supporting children when in difficulties
10.	Giving pocket money to children

In single-parent families those decisions concerning family expenses (e.g. large and day-to-day expenses, children's pocket money) together with efforts to teach and support children are, in the main, (90% and above) the responsibility of the single-mother. By contrast, in the 'average' Greek-Cypriot family the largest group of mothers (84% and above) share such responsibilities with their husbands. There is only one exception, relating to "day-to-day-expenses", in which 44.3% of the mothers reported that they shouldered this responsibility.


If we now compare the main responsibilities undertaken by single-mothers and single-fathers we can see that the rates for both are about the same for all tasks, except for financial issues and homework support. The relevant figures demonstrate that for each parent single parenthood necessitates an increase in tasks relating to childcare and household chores, and the pressure they feel when actively coping with their new family situation is about the same. Single parenthood is demanding on mothers and fathers and often leads to feelings of sadness, loneliness and inadequacy; this corroborates the outcomes from various investigations (i.e. Stewart et al., 1997) which suggest that both men and women experience common anxieties when they become single parents. This new state of affairs is usually more difficult for Greek-Cypriot single fathers who, in a two-parent family, are mainly responsible for the family budget whereas concerning other tasks, i.e. practical childcare, child rearing and household chores, they have secondary or no responsibility. Consequently, single parenthood brings all together new responsibilities.

A comparison between the main responsibilities undertaken by ex-husbands, based on what single mothers and fathers in mainstream Greek-Cypriot families reported (Graph 6), and based on what the husbands or their wives said, shows that the contribution of ex-husbands to almost all family responsibilities is practically zero, except for two issues. More specifically, in single-parent families, 2.4% of ex-

husbands provide the main “financial contribution” and 4.9% dispensed the main additional responsibility for “teaching good manners to children”. At the same time it is noteworthy to mention that fathers in mainstream families do not render much higher participation than ‘ex-husbands’ in single-parent families when it comes to issues concerning practical childcare and the upbringing of children. The overall financial contribution is the only difference between ‘fathers’ and ‘ex-husbands’, and this relates to the fact that Greek-Cypriot fathers, in line with their traditional roles, are the main financial providers. Thus, 45.5% of fathers in mainstream Greek-Cypriot families shoulder the “main responsibility for the family budget”; against only 2.4% of ex-husbands; also against only 0.8% of ex-husbands in single-parent families, 19.1% of the former “decide on large expenses” and 11.8% “give pocket money to children” as against 1.7% of the latter.

Graph 6

Main responsibilities undertaken by ex-husbands and fathers in mainstream GC families
(Comparison between the two groups)



1. Main financial contribution
2. Deciding on large expenses
3. Deciding on day-to-day expenses
4. Taking children to private lessons/extra curriculum activities
5. Helping with children's homework
6. Deciding whether children will go out at night
7. Teaching good manners to children
8. Setting punishments for children
9. Supporting children when in difficulties
10. Giving pocket money to children


Support Network

Single-parents seem to perform most of the chores by themselves but a significant proportion report receiving unpaid help from other sources, especially from their parents, brothers and sisters. As was verified by the survey for single parents, their own parents are their primary source of emotional, material and practical support. The reliance on their own parents is even more apparent in times of family crisis, and as the latter seem to maintain a deep sense of obligation both to their children and grandchildren they are usually more than willing to give everything they can. This highlights the importance of kinship as the foundation of the social support network in Cypriot society. The parents of the single-parent are a bedrock ensuring both safety and stability to a large number of single parents and their children. As Thompson (1999) suggests in a similar context, grandparents seem to “provide crucial help at all levels”, acting “as practical everyday carers, as emotional anchors, firm but gentle childrearers, as models for achievement, as listeners and as transmitters of crucial information”. Grandparents, seem to be ready to make sacrifices with little prospect of seeing any “return” on their investment – save for the respect and love of their children and grandchildren, and surely the pleasure of executing their expected duty.

Analytically, grandmothers and grandfathers presented the highest percentages in all types of supportive roles to single-parent families: “financial” (53%), “help with childcare” (45.4%), “emotional/psychological” (36.2%), “give advice” (35.5%), “help with household chores” (25%), “house repairs” (18.9%) and “hospitality/provide them with a home” (15.9%). Brothers and sisters of single parents also provide “emotional/psychological” support to 16.3% of them, “give advice” (12.1%), “house repairs” (8.8%) and “financial help” (8.1%).

Graph 7

Support network - Main role




Welfare System in Cyprus

There are no special policies in Cyprus for single-parents except for certain provisions in the Law for “Public Assistance” (Cyprus Government Gazette, N.95(I) 2006). The general dissatisfaction of single parents with governmental social policy is demonstrated in Graph 8 which shows that 64.6% are totally disappointed with relevant current policies, 28.6% are satisfied to a “little” or “some” degree, and only a negligible percentage (2.9%) are satisfied to a “much” or “very much” degree.


Graph 8

Satisfaction for social policies concerning single-parent families




Graph 9

Did you apply for government help?



Graph 10

If you did so, how helpful it was ?



To the question (Graph 9) of whether single parents applied to the relevant services of the state for various types of support, more than half (56.5%) responded to the effect that they had asked for financial help, approximately one-fifth (17.9%) had asked for psychological help and one-tenth (8.7%) had requested legal support. From those who did request help (Graph 10), the majority were disappointed with the service they received. Their biggest disappointment was the financial aid they received. Almost 7 out of 10 single parents are totally dissatisfied, or satisfied only to a “little” degree, 2 out of 10 seem to be dissatisfied to “some” degree, and less than 1 out of 10 declare that they are “much” or “very much” satisfied. Participants seemed to be happier with the psychological and legal support they received. Once again, even though, the majority gave a negative reply (47.4% were “a little” or “totally” dissatisfied with the psychological aid they received, and 44.9% were “a little” or “totally” dissatisfied with the legal aid), a substantial number of them said that they were “somewhat”, “much”, or “very much” satisfied.

The research results confirm theories which highlight the weakness in the welfare systems of Mediterranean countries, in responding successfully to the needs of their citizens.

It is worth considering Esping-Andersen’s typology (1990) of European welfare systems. The theory underpinning the typology focuses on the relations between the various actors playing the role of “social insurer”. There are three institutions which deal with social risks: a) the family utilising the principle of reciprocity, b) the market which fosters distribution based on monetary exchanges, and, c) the public

sector which undertakes redistribution. The relative importance of each of these three actors of social protection varies in the different welfare systems, giving rise to three distinct systems: first the liberal system, based on the laws of the free market and on low state intervention (linked with Anglo-Saxon countries); second, the social-democratic system, based on universalism and egalitarianism, found mostly in Scandinavian states; and the conservative-corporatism system found in continental and Mediterranean Europe, in which there is little state provision and considerable reliance on corporate groups.

Critics of Esping-Andersen’s theory suggest that the typology tends to lump together countries whose social welfare systems are quite different. For instance, the countries of continental Europe (i.e. France and Germany), have far more comprehensive welfare schemes than the countries of south Europe such as Greece, Italy and Spain. Trifiletti (1999) proposes that the welfare system of the Mediterranean states is “lacking” and that their family policy is often tacit and weak. Mediterranean systems seem to assume that social risks for the individual should be partially or fully covered by the immediate family, or even the extended family (Trifiletti, 1999). In the same vein, Moreno suggests that family support in south Europe substitutes for the weak welfare state; intra-familial transfers being both material and immaterial (Moreno, 1997). Consequently, family-centrism goes hand in hand with the passive or undeveloped family policy in Mediterranean countries.

Cyprus seems to be a good example of the Mediterranean model. In our analysis we have pointed out the following “vicious circle”:

1. Since the family is strong and cohesive	then →	it is not necessary for the state to support its citizens
2. Since the state is not supportive of its citizens	then →	the family has to remain strong and cohesive

Greek-Cypriots do not seem to expect too much from the state precisely because they expect almost everything from their families. When their own marriage or family is not functioning properly, as in the case of single parents, they often turn to their parental families for support. And even when they do resort to the state, it is only, or mostly, for financial aid as they perceive the state as a substitute for the ‘father-provider’. As regards psychological, emotional or other types of social support, they still turn to their immediate kin and not to the more impersonal services of the state. Greek-Cypriots do not press the state hard enough for it to develop the required policies for maintaining a system which may provide good quality services to individuals at risk. This is not to say that Greek-Cypriots do not hope for some kind of state assistance but they do not take it to be “self-evident” as it is in other more advanced European countries. In this way the system seems to perpetuate itself.

Notes

1. The research programme “Single-Parent Families in Cyprus” focused on Greek-Cypriot single-parent families, and especially the social, psychological and financial aspects. Findings have been compared with those of other European societies in order to identify similarities and differences. A study of the current social policies in these societies enabled a number of proposals to be put forward as to how relevant social policies can be improved in Cyprus, drawing on the experience of the social welfare systems of other European countries.

The research was conducted by distributing 600 confidential questionnaires to single-parent families in both rural and urban areas of the Republic of Cyprus. Another 50 in-depth interviews were also carried out using semi-structured questionnaires, as well as two focus groups which aimed to investigate acutely the problems these families face. Officials from the Social Welfare Service, members of Parliament, a judge from the Family Court and the presidents of various NGOs were also interviewed in an attempt to ascertain the ‘official views’ on the phenomenon.

The research was conducted by the University of Nicosia/Intercollege in collaboration with different governmental and non-governmental organisations (the Mediterranean Institute of Gender Studies, the Cyprus Sociological Association, the Parliamentary Committee of Labour and Social Insurance, the Social Welfare Services and the Pancyprian Association of Single-Parent Families and Friends), and was funded by the Research Promotion Foundation.

2. Most similar percentage: Greece: 5.10%, Croatia: 10.51%, Liechtenstein: 18.90%, Poland: 18.45%, Slovakia: 18.45%, Spain: 26.57%, Ireland: 31.99%, Netherlands: 34.89%, United Kingdom: 42.94%, Sweden: 55.45%, Estonia: 58.51%, and Iceland: 65.72% (Eurostat, 2005).
3. This percentage includes newborns born from Greek-Cypriot but also foreign mothers.
4. Based on the results of the “Study for Leisure Time, Employment, Relationships, Perceptions and Problems of the Cypriot Youth” the two most important pre-requisites for a successful marriage, for the Greek-Cypriot young people between the ages of 15-29 years are:
 1. “Mutual respect and understanding” (91.7%)
 2. “A good sexual relationship” (86.1%)
5. The rural pattern of most women contributing usually as unwaged domestic labour on family farms and some women working as day labourers has changed to a pattern whereby many married women, and most single women, continue to seek waged employment in the formal and informal labour market.
6. In particular, the percentage of young people living with their parents between the ages of 18 and 21 years is 84.4%, in the age group 22-25 years it is 62.6% and in the age group 26-29 years old it is 25.5%.
7. The data include the total population of Cyprus during this period. There is no separation between Orthodox, Muslims and other minorities.
8. There were approximately, 3,000 Greek Cypriots dead and 1,500 missing, as a result of the invasion.

9. The most recent data for unwanted pregnancies and abortions can be found in the survey "Health in the Relationships between the two Genders and Sexuality" (Chrysanthou, 2006) carried out by the Cyprus Youth Organisation and the Institute of Reproductive Medicine of Cyprus. In particular, 9.5% of the girls between the ages of 13-18 years old admitted that some of them had faced the problem of unwanted pregnancy and abortion either in the past or the present, and some others confessed to having given birth to a child.
10. This research was entitled: "The State of the Contemporary Greek-Cypriot Family". The aim of the research was to map aspects of the life and values of contemporary Greek-Cypriot families. The research was conducted by distributing 1,100 confidential questionnaires to persons between the ages of 15-64 years in both rural and urban areas of the Republic of Cyprus. Another 50 in-depth interviews were also carried out using semi-structured questionnaires, as well as the three focus groups all aiming to investigate in more detail the opinions, values and attitudes of parents and children. The research was conducted by the Research Centre of Intercollege (2002-2004), and was funded by the National Committee on the Family.

Bibliography

- Chrysanthou, A. (2006) 'Health in the Relationships between the Two Genders and Sexuality'. Research undertaken for the Institute of Reproductive Medicine of Cyprus and Cyprus Youth Organisation, Nicosia.
- Cliquet, R. (2003) 'Major Trends Affecting Families in the New Millennium – Western Europe and North America'. UN Programme on the Family: Tenth Anniversary of the International Year of the Family. Available at [<http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/family/Publications/PubFrame.html>].
- Cyprus Government Gazette, N.86(I), (28 April 2006) Public Assistance and Service Law of 2006. No. 4085.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- European Commission of Human Rights (1976) *Report on Violence Against Greek-Cypriot Women*. Geneva, Council of Europe.
- Eurostat (2005) *Live Births Outside Marriage*. Available at [<http://www.epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&plugin=0&language=en&pcode=cab13584>].
- Giddens, A. (2002) *Runaway World – How Globalization is Reshaping our Lives*. London, Profile Books Ltd.
- Intercollege – Business Development Centre – Consultancy Unit, (2002) 'Study for the Formulation of Demographic Policy – Proposal for Cyprus'. Research undertaken by Intercollege, Nicosia.
- Josiane, C. and Riga, A-V. (1997) *Unmarried Mothers: Women's Movement from Suppression to Liberation [Ανύπαντρες Μητέρες: Γυναικείο Κίνημα από την Υποταγή στην Απελευθέρωση]*. Athens, Gutenberg.

- Loizos, P. (1975) *The Greek Gift - Politics in a Cypriot Village*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- Markides, K., Nikita, G. and Rangou, E. (1978) *Lysi: Social Change in a Cypriot Village*. Nicosia, Social Research Centre.
- Moreno, L. (1997) 'The Spanish Development of Southern Welfare'. Instituto de Estudios Sociales Avanzados – Working Paper 97-04.
- Peristianis, N., Avraamides, L. and Kokkinou, K. (2004) 'The State of the Contemporary Greek-Cypriot Family'. Research undertaken for Nicosia, Research Center-Intercollege.
- Peristianis, N., Fakiolas, N. and Kokkinou, K. (2007) 'Study for Leisure Time, Employment, Relationships, Perceptions and Problems of the Cypriot Youth'. Research undertaken for Nicosia, Research Center-Intercollege and Institute of Social Innovation.
- Peristianis, N., and Kokkinou, K. (2007) 'Single-Parent Families in Cyprus'. Unpublished research. Intercollege, Nicosia.
- Popenoe, D. (1993) 'American Family Decline, 1960-1990: A Review and Appraisal', *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 55, pp. 527-555.
- Statistical Service of the Republic of Cyprus. Report and General Abstracts of the Census of 1881. Nicosia (extracted from Barry, F.W. (1884) *Colonial Government. Report on the Census of Cyprus, 1881 with Appendix*. London, Eyre and Spottiswoode).
- Statistical Service of the Republic of Cyprus (1963). *Demographic and Social Statistics: Population and Demography. Volume III Demographic Characteristics*. Nicosia, Printing Office of the Republic of Cyprus.
- Statistical Service of the Republic of Cyprus (1966) *Demographic Report, 1965*. Nicosia, Printing Office of the Republic of Cyprus.
- Statistical Service of the Republic of Cyprus (1971) *Demographic Report, 1970*. Nicosia, Printing Office of the Republic of Cyprus.
- Statistical Service of the Republic of Cyprus (2003) *Census of the Population, 2001 – Households and Housing Units. Population Statistics, Volume III, Report No. 18*. Nicosia, Printing Office of the Republic of Cyprus.
- Statistical Service of the Republic of Cyprus (2006) *Demographic Report, 2005. Population Statistics, Series II, Report No. 43*. Nicosia, Printing Office of the Republic of Cyprus.
- Stewart, A., Copeland, A., Chester, N., Malley, J. and Barenbaum, N. (1997) *Separating Together – How Divorce Transforms Families*. New York, The Guilford Press.
- Thompson, P. (1999) 'The Role of Grandparents. When Parents Part or Die: Some Reflections on the Mythical Decline on the Extended Family', *Ageing and Society*, Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 471-503.
- Trifiletti, R. (1999) 'Southern European Welfare Regimes and the Worsening Position of Women', *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol. 9, No. 1. pp. 49-64. London, Sage Publications.
- Vassiliadou, M. (2002) 'Questioning Nationalism: The Patriarchal and National Struggles of Cypriot Women Within a European Context', *The European Journal of Women's Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 459-482. London, Sage Publications.

A BARRICADE, A BRIDGE AND A WALL: CYPRIOT JOURNALISM AND THE MEDIATION OF CONFLICT IN CYPRUS*

Mashoed Bailie and Bekir Azgin

Abstract

This paper draws on frameworks provided by scholars concerned with the possibility of peace oriented journalism in order to highlight a decidedly conflict-centred approach guiding the production and circulation of information in Cypriot media and underscore the problematic (and often unquestioned) role that Cypriot media play in helping to shape the knowledge environments in which publics and policy makers take their cues and consider their options for intervention and action in the seemingly intractable “Cyprus Problem”. One example through which this dynamic becomes visible is a series of news articles published between November 2005 and February 2006 reporting on the opening of an historic landmark that has divided Nicosia,¹ the capital of Cyprus, for over forty years. These newspaper articles suggest that the Cypriot media embrace a conflict-centred approach to peace efforts by shaping news that contributes to the increased mystification of the conflict and to a retrenching of divisive attitudes, sympathetic to a cementing of division. The “shaping” takes place indirectly through the “selection” of quotes from elite sources that re-present dominant points of view from within each community. News reporting tends to follow the lead and reproduce the limited perspectives of major national party politics rather than provide a sustained critique of those points of view.

Keywords: Nicosia, Communication, Media, Journalist, Journalism, Peace, Press, Ledra Street

Introduction

This exploration of the role of Cypriot media at that intersection between institutional and private performances comes at an important historical moment in Cypriot political life: one providing a momentary space for respective Greek and Turkish Cypriot opposition parties and politicians to speak out on previously unpopular issues including the contested meanings of “Cypriotness”, “unification”

“demilitarization” and the transformation of the island’s young Republic into a new “Federal Republic of Cyprus”. At the time of writing however, it seems that the governments of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities are merely adopting “languages of unification” as techniques for quite separate agendas.

For most of us, access to the machinations of the political life of both communities means access to those mediated representations that flow through the various communication channels, either state or privately owned, including television, radio, newspapers, magazines and increasingly, the internet. Indeed, for the vast majority of people concerned with the current stalemate in Cyprus politics, to speak of Cyprus is often not to speak of “Cyprus-as-such” but rather to speak of “mediated representations of Cyprus”: representations that arise out of the interrelationship between prior knowledge, journalistic performances, media institutions and social, political and economic contextual constraints, each playing a role in shaping the way we ultimately come to think about conflict in Cyprus.

Cypriot media industries are enmeshed in pervasive contemporary political-economic, social and cultural dynamics rooted in idealised or reactionary versions of the past.² Historically, the Cypriot media, far from providing the necessary foundations for increased understanding and the promotion of peace, have tended to encourage continued bi-communal conflict, separatism and suspicion or, to the contrary, overly simplistic and short-sighted solutions to the resolution of conflict and the promotion of peace. The pivot around which this social dynamic finds its moorings, its most common reference point, is famously referred to as “The Cyprus Problem”.

Although conflict-oriented journalism, between and within Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot media, is often identified with the outbreak of bi-communal violence in the mid-1950s and again in the mid-1960s, it is important to clarify that antagonistic conflict-centred media production has much earlier and therefore that much more entrenched beginnings.

Journalistic tendencies toward conflict reporting in Cyprus are deeply rooted in history. Conflict-centred journalism transcends the bi-communal disturbances of the 1950s and 1960s. During that time period, inter-communal fighting only exasperated an already long standing journalistic tradition and helped to align both Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot newspapers and journalists with “national struggles”. (With the advent of radio and television and, later still, the internet, they became “national struggle media”).

The first Cypriot newspaper began publication in the last two decades of the nineteenth century.³ From their inception, the Greek Cypriot newspapers have

“persistently and vigorously promoted the demand of the Greeks of Cyprus that the island should be ceded to Greece, thus achieving the vision of their national restoration with their incorporation into the national body” (Sophocleus, 2006, p. 1).

The Enosis demand of the Greek Cypriots was vigorously opposed by the Turkish Cypriots.⁴ The earliest newspaper, Zaman [The Times] of which copies survive, states in its first issue, that one of the purposes for its publication was “to fight against the numerous Greek newspapers which were propagating the Greek view on the Cyprus question and to resist the Enosis movement” (Azgın, 1998, p. 642). Yeni Zaman [The New Times] which was published one year later on 22 August 1892, states that its aim was to refute the Greek views of the Greek Cypriot newspaper Phoni Tis Kyprou which was propagating Enosis (ibid., p. 643).

When we look at contemporary journalistic practices in the Cypriot media, and their deeply conflict-centred and antagonistic form, it is not difficult to recognise the remnants of this late nineteenth century historical struggle⁵ and see that its contemporary forms also concern struggles over whose vision of a future Cyprus might be realised.

It is understood both from critical political economic and cultural perspectives in communication studies that media knowledge, in general, is never value neutral (Calabrese and Sparks, 2005; Mandelzis, 2003; Morley and Robins, 1995; Mosco and Reddick, 1997; Mosco, 2006; McChesney and Hackett, 2005). Moreover, media representations tend to obscure their own ideological origins to such an extent that one may actually feel that one is reading about an event rather than a media construction of an event. Furthermore, media stories have the capacity for suggesting frameworks for thinking through social conflicts as though they were the only or most likely frameworks within which conflict might be resolved – or left unresolved (Shinar, 2004). Such frameworks are then often taken up by social actors in mundane social practices and social scientists in the analysis of conflict and peace, as though looking at an actual event, rather than at an ideological mediated reconstruction of it.

Media provide ways of thinking about what counts as important as they partially shape the boundaries within which we make sense out of our social world. Thus, when we engage media knowledge, we are exposed to information that has been purposefully constructed from particular points of view and with specific interests in mind. Our limited access to direct experience of heightened politicised events often inhibits our capacity for genuine reflection, analysis and critique of media representations (Morley and Robbins, 1995), impressing upon the majority of readers or listeners a certain “truth value” in as much as the event itself was even worthy of its status in the hierarchy of the news agenda. Events are often reported

in ways that accentuate conflict rather than opportunities for settlement (Entman, 2004; Lazar and Lazar, 2004; Ottosen, 1995; Wolfsfeld, 2004) and especially with regard to news reports of social conflict, it is difficult not to take media agendas as foundations for thinking through solutions to historically difficult problems, or as starting points from which to consider actions that might lead to peace or, at the least, to the resolution of conflict.

We decided to follow the developments of the Ledra/Lokmacı [Lokmah-juh] story as it arose across the Greek, Turkish and English language Cypriot press based upon the premise of the historical importance of the Old City of Nicosia for both Turkish and Greek Cypriots and especially in the divergent account that both have of what the importance of the Old City is. Otherwise, the Lokmacı/Ledra⁶ story is one of a myriad of stories whose beginning points and endings are often obscure and difficult to follow. Indeed, we argue that the life span of such stories and their sudden and often “unexplained deaths” are indicative of the volatile and unstable conflict atmosphere among media owners and workers in Cyprus where the value of a story is more often in the sensational, the unpredictable, and the dramatic, than in providing firm ground for critical thought or civic action and participation. Indeed, as we explore the news reports concerning the Lokmacı/Ledra story, it quickly becomes apparent that they give more weight to agendas that have been previously inscribed by various political parties and politicians than to independent, investigative analysis – going so far as to lead with the frameworks provided by those in power. This leads to a poverty of reflection, analysis and critique while ultimately producing little that might allow a citizenry to reflect on alternative and perhaps more constructive approaches to the building of cooperation and community.

The dynamic media environment witnessed between 2003 and 2004⁷ continued, albeit with much less dynamism, through 2005 with a daily stream of media reports of much needed “confidence building measures” between the two Cypriot communities. These measures included the importance of increasing the number of meetings between political parties from both communities with a view toward resolving disputes over missing persons, property, movement, and ultimately, what shape the new Federal Republic of Cyprus should take. Also on the daily media agenda were issues of increased access for the Turkish and Greek Cypriot citizenry to “the other side’s” media reports, the Turkish Cypriot demand to be rewarded for their “yes vote”, followed by reports of the Greek Cypriot administration’s politically savvy (or, alternatively, unscrupulous tactics) for thwarting all such attempts to satisfy that demand.

For us, revisiting the Lokmacı/Ledra story represented the possibility of following a media event from its inception through to its conclusion (although it remains, at the time of writing, unresolved). We realised that it is a near impossibility

to follow all stories begun by mass media, being conscious of their beginning points, their twists and turns and then their eventual demise or conclusions. This difficulty also constitutes one of the crucial, although perhaps unintended, dynamics of media power: shaping a political atmosphere by introducing and then dropping particular stories that shape the overall climate without impressing their entry and exit points on media audiences. This is not a question of media having a particular “affect” on audiences but rather of the way the media shape events: constructing and reshaping the boundaries within which we always and actively make sense out of total environments.

Thus, our approach to the collection of the material for this study was to begin with a question concerning the possibility that the Cypriot media might play a legitimate role in the promotion of a framework for thinking through peace-oriented solutions to Cyprus’ intractable political and social problems, while entertaining the possibility that they may, to the contrary, prove culpable in the more generally obvious climate of conflict and that they might reveal an obstinate refusal to provide an empathetic mooring for the exploration of peaceful solutions to the long history of conflict in Cyprus. In other words, do Cypriot media promote peace-oriented or conflict-oriented solutions to conflict? We selected an example of mediated reality that would provide a number of entry points into the broader historical malaise⁸ that has thwarted conflict resolution for over forty years, and followed the media construct from its entry into media discourse through to its “untimely” demise: prior to resolution of the initial problematic.

Measuring Conflict and the Way toward Cooperation

In this initial exploration of the Cypriot media’s propensity for peace-oriented or conflict-oriented reporting, we draw upon two contemporary scholarly sources for categorising the value of media stories in terms of their potential for promoting a space for dialogue and discussion or for their tendency to prematurely close off such avenues and shut down debate. Wolfsfeld (2004) provides criteria for discerning four major editorial values in the production of news stories:

Table 1: News of Peace: The Editorial Process

	News	Not News
IMMEDIACY	Events Specific Actions	Processes Long-term policies
DRAMA	Violence Crisis Conflict Extremism Dangers Internal Discord Major Breakthrough	Calm Lack of Crisis Cooperation Moderation Opportunities Internal Consensus Incremental Progress
SIMPLICITY	Opinions Images Major Personalities Two-sided conflict	Ideology Texts Institutions Multi-sided Conflicts
ETHNOCENTRISM	Our Beliefs Our Suffering Their Brutality Our Myths/Symbols	Their Beliefs Their Suffering Our Brutality Their Myths/Symbols

[Wolfsfeld, 2004, p. 16]

The criteria of immediacy, drama, simplicity and ethnocentrism in the table above speak directly to the overwhelming drive behind the production of media stories in the Cypriot press: there is a tendency to avoid talking about processes that have become stalled, or are not going to be acted upon imminently; a focus on the drama of conflict and difference; an apparent addiction to the “breaking news story” that promises to overcome a previously insurmountable obstacle or resolve all previous conflict-oriented media stories – only to be followed-up quickly by another conflict-oriented report that undermines the “breaking news”; an addiction to the personalities rather than a focus on processes and the institutionalised constraints within which these personalities act; a reduction of complex issues to “them or us” or “win-lose” and an insistence on accentuating what “they did” to “us” and how “we” suffered at “their” hands. Do journalists in the Cypriot media encourage empathy with “the other”, accentuate opportunities through dialogue, promote win-win orientations for progress through a process, reveal the multiple and competing interests at work in every issue, or provide explanatory frames for understanding “their myths” or “their beliefs and values” in relation to “our” own? Whereas we agree with Wolfsfeld that the four dominant criteria for editorial decision-making (immediacy, drama, simplicity and ethnocentrism) provide a valuable explanatory framework, not least for the issue currently under consideration, we do not see these criteria as somehow “unavoidable” or as

“natural” to journalists or journalism. As we discuss in our conclusion, these criteria have everything to do with the specific ways in which the media have developed historically as private elite-centred and highly centralised communication systems and it is precisely this underlying power relation that “naturalises” values like competition, sensationalism, antagonism, aggression, and the desire to “win” at the expense of others. It is these purposefully structured relations that guide the expectations of both editors and journalists and within which such journalistic routines and practices are normalised.

Johan Galtung’s “peace journalism” model (Lynch and McGoldrick, 2005) provides a second entry point to consider those aspects of Cypriot media reporting on the Lokmacı/Ledra issue that accentuate either peace and conflict resolution oriented journalism, or war/violence oriented journalism.

PEACE/CONFLICT JOURNALISM	WAR/VIOLENCE JOURNALISM
I. PEACE/CONFLICT-ORIENTED	I. WAR/VIOLENCE-ORIENTED
explore conflict formation, x parties, y goals, z issues general zero-sum orientation	focus on conflict arena, 2 parties, 1 goal (win), war, general “win, win” orientation
open space, open time; causes and outcomes anywhere, also in history/culture	closed space, closed time; causes and exits in arena who threw the first stone
making conflicts transparent	making wars opaque/secret
giving voice to all parties; empathy, understanding	“us-them” journalism, propaganda, voice for “us” ⁹
see conflict/war as problem, focus on conflict creativity	see “them” as the problem, focus on who prevails in war
humanisation of all sides; more so the worse the weapon	dehumanisation of “them”; more so the worse the weapon ¹⁰
<u>proactive</u> : prevention before any violence/war occurs	<u>reactive</u> : waiting for violence before reporting
focus on invisible effects of violence (trauma and glory, damage to structure/culture)	focus only on visible effect of violence (killed, wounded and material damage)
II. TRUTH-ORIENTED	11. PROPAGANDA-ORIENTED
expose untruths on all sides/uncover all cover-ups	expose “their” untruths/help “our” cover-ups/lies
III. PEOPLE-ORIENTED	III. ELITE-ORIENTED
focus on suffering all over; on women, aged, children, giving voice to voiceless	focus on “our” suffering; on able-bodied elite males, being their mouth-piece
give name to all evil-doers	give name of their evil-doers
focus on people peace-makers	focus on elite peace-makers
IV. SOLUTION-ORIENTED	IV. VICTORY-ORIENTED
peace = non-violence + creativity	peace = victory + ceasefire
highlight peace initiatives, also to prevent more war	conceal peace initiatives, before victory is at hand
focus on structure, culture, and peaceful society	focus on treaty, institution, the controlled society
aftermath: resolution, reconstruction, reconciliation	leaving for another war, return if the old flares up again

[Johan Galtung’s Peace Journalism Model in Lynch and McGoldrick, 2005, p. 6]

The model, adapted by Lynch and McGoldrick (2005) has also been adapted for use in other studies of communities in conflict (Shinar, 2004, p. 3). It is important to recognise that the “peace/conflict” approach in the left column of Galtung’s chart (see p. 63) insists that conflict is not “naturally” resolved through violence. Furthermore, unlike Galtung’s war/violence column, where conflict is always represented as “them” and “us” in a zero-sum game, conflict for peace oriented journalism is a complex and multi-party process where the emphasis is shifted from “them” and “us” and who wins, to a dynamic dialogue between multiple partners who, through creative responses to apparent conflict, rise above the conflict paradigm to an entirely new way of understanding their relations to one another. A major difficulty for journalists who attempt to move from the zero-sum game of war/violence oriented journalism toward a less conflict-driven journalism is posed when the communities in conflict (such as is the case in Cyprus) are represented in an overly simplistic “us and them” frame and where journalists have tended, historically, to play a role in support of their own side against the “Other”. As Blasi (2004) argues, “A process of creating social commitment to victory over the enemy is typical when group conflicts are constructed as competitive processes”. Blasi goes on to point out that journalists who attempt to introduce alternative conflict-resolution techniques into their reporting “are denounced as disloyal” to their “own side” (p. 9).

While our analysis of Cypriot media benefits primarily from utilising Wolfsfeld’s conceptualisation of major editorial values, it is useful to note that what Galtung identifies as “peace/conflict journalism” corresponds precisely to Wolfsfeld’s “not news” column while Wolfsfeld’s “news worthy” column fits succinctly with Galtung’s “war/violence” column. Thus, while for Wolfsfeld “peace is not news”, for Galtung, the appropriate role for the media in democratic societies is to promote reflection, empathy and understanding. This is something we return to in our concluding remarks.

Combining these two entry points – a consideration of major editorial values and the distinction between peace-oriented versus war/violence-oriented journalistic approaches to the production and circulation of stories about events – provides a useful frame through which to re-evaluate the boundaries that Cypriot media provide the general public for thinking through and reacting to an apparent “peace building” activity between the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot communities. Below we consider Cyprus newspaper orientations to a potential peace building activity between the two Cypriot communities in Cyprus. First we provide a brief overview of the event and then we consider the media reports of the event that were published across the Turkish, Greek and English language Cypriot newspapers during the four months between November 2005 and February 2006.

The Lokmacı/Ledra Story

In November 2005 a story made the headlines across Cyprus reporting that the walls dividing Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots in the centre of Cyprus' capital city of Nicosia (the "last wall of Europe" as it was often referred to) would be demolished and that the major thoroughfare, known as the Lokmacı barricade to Turkish Cypriots and as Ledra Street to Greek Cypriots¹¹ would be reopened to citizens of both communities. There was an initial excitement among the citizenry of the two communities as the story "broke" in the media in November 2005, reaching its height in December and then all but collapsing over the following two months. In November, as the story surfaced, we recovered 25 articles across the Cypriot press landscape, in December the number reached a dramatic 133, in January the story diminished to 17 articles followed by 12 in February and then abruptly disappeared.

A general survey of the orientation of newspaper stories across the four month period in question, revealed a consistent pattern that accords with Wolfsfeld's chart of editorial values as we review them below. Rather than interrupting the "flow" of news stories throughout the period in question, we first give an encapsulated overview of the dynamics involved in press reports across the time-line of the media event and then follow-up with a brief analysis of the editorial values inherent in the stories. It becomes clear as the articles unfold, that these editorial values are rooted in the "event" and "specific actions" column of the "immediacy" category rather than in an interest in processes or long-term policies.

Immediacy is imminent in the following synopsis of four months of news reporting on the possible opening of a passage between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot sectors of the capital city of Nicosia. While we will also highlight the other characteristics of drama, simplicity and ethnocentrism at the conclusion of this overview of the press, immediacy as an initial category focuses attention on the propensity in the Cypriot press to be drawn to actions and events rather than to the processes that lie behind them. Wolfsfeld (2004) argues that this leaves citizens and policy makers with "an extremely narrow and simplistic view of what is happening" in the world around them (p. 17).

The November Thrill

As the story of Lokmacı/Ledra was released to the public through the Cypriot press, those early November 2005 reports were filled with undiluted anticipation. The Greek Cypriot Financial Mirror¹² exclaimed: "The Cypriot government is ready to proceed with the opening of Ledra Street ..." and "We are ready and the moment we receive the green light we can be ready in four weeks." The Turkish Cypriot semi-state controlled BRT¹³ claimed: "The TRNC President has said that the

Lokmacı crossing point will be opened soon". The Greek Cypriot governments Public Information Office (PIO)¹⁴ declared "Turkey to donate money for the opening of the Ledra street crossing point". The Greek Cypriot Sunday Mail¹⁵ celebrated: "After 30 years it is finally starting to look like a road again as history was being made yesterday in Nicosia" and "Greek Cypriot soldiers could only look on in amazement ...". The Times online¹⁶ carried a story internationally, written by Greek Cypriot journalist Michael Theodoulou in Nicosia with the headline "Cyprus tears down wall for Christmas" and exclaimed that both the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot Mayors of the Old City of Nicosia were expecting the opening of the border imminently: "The plans are all ready,' Semavi Aşık [Ashuk] of the Turkish Cypriot authority said ..." and "Michael Zampellas, the Mayor of the Greek Cypriot part of the capital welcomed the move. 'We are ready to open too', he said".

There were no revelations as to how this miraculous event had taken place, no discussions concerning the processes that had led up to this supposed "agreement" to open the divided capital of Cyprus, nor any information concerning a long-term policy of the island's reunification of which this "opening" would play a part.¹⁷

Before the month of November had come to a close, and without any attempt to re-define the issue or explain the significant problems that (one assumes) were being thrashed out behind the scenes and within and between political parties and military interests across the island, the media's focus shifted dramatically. BRT reported on 26 November 2005¹⁸ "President Mehmet Ali Talat has accused the Leader of the Greek Cypriot Administration Tassos Papadopoulos of carrying out a state campaign to maintain the division of the island" and that it was "the Greek Cypriot Administration which had been trying to prevent the opening of the Lokmacı Gate." Cyprus Today,¹⁹ the Turkish Cypriot English language weekly claimed that "Mr. Talat said the Lokmacı opening was falling victim to the same Greek Cypriot foot-dragging ..." and that he said "the Greek Cypriots would place every obstacle in its way because the opening of Lokmacı would sound the death knell for division in Cyprus".

The December Chill

December 2005 saw a dramatic increase in storytelling around the Lokmacı/Ledra²⁰ issue with 133 articles being published throughout the month although none went further in explanatory value around the deeper issues involved in the opening of the street. On 2 December 2005, in an apparent response to the Turkish administration's replacement of the barricade with a foot-bridge, a Simerini²¹ story ran with the headline: "They opened roads for Attila" stating that "The Turkish Cypriot plans to open the barricade are wicked and masterminded by Ankara. Mehmet Ali Talat is the occupation leader ... in collaboration with Ankara". On 5

December 2005, the same newspaper²² claimed that: “The occupying forces are grabbing more land ... something that seems to be on their cards for the whole of the island”. Then on 7 December 2005, Simerini²³ exclaimed, with a headline that read “Even if a Turk becomes a bridge”: “A Cypriot wise proverb says ‘even if a Turk becomes a bridge, do not pass over it’. The hypocrisy, the mockery, the arrogance and the irony/sarcasm of the occupational regime has reached the zenith”. BRT²⁴ on 8 December 2005 claimed “The Greek Cypriot side is trying to prevent the opening” and is “responsible for the deadlock” while the “TRNC government is determined to open the gate on the scheduled date” and K/brs²⁵ published an article by Hasan Hastürer where he claimed: “The truth of the matter is that the Greek Cypriot side doesn’t want to open a new gate and improve crossings before an [overall] solution [to the Cyprus Problem]”.

On 9 December the Turkish Cypriot Anglophone Cyprus Observer²⁶ quoted the Greek Cypriot President Papadopoulos saying “The case of the Ledra Street will not be a precedent for the occupation forces to claim half of the buffer zone area, something which seems to be their plan throughout Cyprus” and in another article, “Discussions in Cyprus are stuck on a bridge” the newspaper claims that “The efforts made by Turkish Cypriots to open the Lokmacı ... is being prevented by the Southern President, Tassos Papadopoulos”, paraphrasing Ferdi Sabit Soyer asking the United Nations to “point out the ‘reluctant side’ on this issue”. On 10 December 2005, an article written by DISY Member of Parliament, Nikos Tornarides, appeared in Simerini,²⁷ where he claims that “There is a very special symbolism at the Ledra Street: It is the wall of invasion and division, the last wall that continues to exist in a European capital”. Tornarides goes on to declare: “We must find the way to show who really does not want understanding, who is trying to gain points against the solution of the Cyprus problem”.

The whole media orientation of the issue had been transformed from one of opening a street to ease the building of relationships between the two ethnic Cypriot communities, to one of demolishing a bridge that now rested uneasily on that very street.

On 13 December 2005, Politis,²⁸ accused the Turkish Cypriot administration: “The aim of the Turkish plan is to annex half of the dead zone”, while on 15 December 2005 an editorial in Haravgi,²⁹ titled “They should not ruin the common vision” stated that: “Only yesterday [so-called prime minister Ferdi Sabit Soyer] showed that he is the mouth piece of Ankara and the military and the defender of invasion ... he is continuing to make provocations by talking of the occupied areas as if they are his kingdom or empire as he talks about ‘the boundaries’”.

By mid-December 2005, there had been virtually no historical context to the ongoing “battle of words” expressed through the Greek and Turkish Cypriot media.

An article that ran on December 15th in Turkish Cypriot *Kıbrıs*³⁰ under the title “Why this secrecy at Lokmacı” similarly failed to unravel the complex issue: rather than exploring why the public was being given information peace-meal and without any solid historical foundation upon which to consider the issues at stake, the article focused instead upon the irony inherent in the fact that while it was “our” (Turkish Cypriot) side that wanted the gate opened, Turkish Cypriot reporters were forbidden from taking photographs of the ongoing work from “our side” and had to cross into the Greek Cypriot sector in order to shoot images of the new bridge. “It seems that the military is not as willing as the civil authorities to pull down this wall” the article concludes.

Greek Cypriot *Simerini*³¹ newspaper accused the Turkish Cypriot President, Mehmet Ali Talat, of becoming “a slave of the bridge” in an article by Kostakis Antoniou on 15 December 2005. In Antoniou’s article, the bridge is likened to a “Trojan horse”, Talat is labelled the “leader of occupation”, and while claiming that even the “Turkish Cypriot citizens are angry with the bridge”, the article warns Talat that he “... cannot play tricks with the empty stomachs of Turkish Cypriots any longer”. The Cypriot media’s focus on the apparent antagonism between the two communities, or at least, between the two Administrations representing the two communities, became heightened in newspaper reports as the issue raged on past mid-December with *Yenidüzen*³² claiming, on 16 December 2005. “The bridge at Lokmacı will not be pulled down. The real problem is that they do not want to open the gate”. On 18 December the Greek Cypriot newspaper *Alitheia*,³³ ran with the headline “Kyprianou: The responsibility is not ours” claiming that “The [Greek Cypriot] government is definitely not responsible for the Ledra Gate ... the responsibility rests with the [Turkish] occupying army and the Turkish Cypriot leadership”.

On 19 December *BRT*³⁴ reported that the Turkish Cypriot side was demanding that the Greek Cypriots “first demolish the wall of shame” and complaining that the international community was not bringing enough pressure on the Greek Cypriots to demolish their wall before discussing whether Turkish Cypriots should demolish their bridge while the Greek Cypriot *Phileftheros*,³⁵ declared “Ledra Street as a symbol of Turkish arbitrariness”, explaining that “The problem is not ‘the bridge’ which prevents the re-opening of the Ledra. The real problem is more general, it is the need to oppose every Turkish military obstacle which was forced [upon us] by occupation and invasion. Every effort on the Turkish side is based on lowering the status of our government in parallel with small steps to increase that of Talat and his unlawful regime”. Again, on 21 December 2005, *Phileftheros*³⁶ declared “Their actions do anything but help improve the climate between the two communities”.

As Christmas day arrived, the Turkish Cypriot newspaper *Afrika*³⁷ was reporting that the Speaker of the Greek Cypriot House (and General Secretary of the Greek

Cypriot AKEL), Demitris Christofias, had declared that Turkish Cypriot “unilateral celebrations” over the completion of their part of the Lokmacı/Ledra “are good for nothing” and that “bridges that are built for show and the military use must be pulled down”. Three days later the newspaper quoted the Greek Cypriot daily *Phileleftheros* claiming that the “Turkish Cypriot administration has postponed the opening and the celebrations of Ledra gate to the new year” claiming that “the postponement was due to external pressures” but also claiming that the Turkish Cypriot government’s Secretary had insisted that “The Ledra Bridge will not be pulled down”. As December came to an end, the media’s focus had shifted slightly again with the Greek Cypriot *Cyprus Mail*³⁸ revealing that the Turkish Cypriots had offered “to dismantle the controversial bridge” but had also asked Greek Cypriots to remove “offensive signs”.³⁹ Summing up the whole “event”, at the end of a tumultuous month of “media warmongering”, the newspaper quoted the Turkish Cypriot municipality’s Deputy Mayor Semavi Aşık as saying: “Two months ago it seemed necessary to have a bridge there. But over the last two months it has become clear in discussions with all the bodies involved in the project, including government and the military, that it is not imperative. I think we can convince everyone of this”. On the last day of December, *Phileleftheros*⁴⁰ quoted the ex-Minister of the Interior, Dinos Michaelides as saying “If the bridge is not demolished, let’s one-sidedly close all of the gates”.

What were those discussions referred to by the Turkish Cypriot Deputy Mayor about? Who were the “everybody” involved? How did it become clear that it was no longer necessary? Why was it necessary to begin with? Who is left that needs to be “convinced”? None of these issues, these processes or procedures found their way into the light of a single December Cypriot media news day. Clearly, they were not considered to be newsworthy.

The January Freeze

Turkish Cypriot *Kıbrıs*⁴¹ treated readers to a “summary of the year” on 1 January 2006 where they traced the root of the Lokmacı/Ledra story back to 27 September 2005 when the Turkish Cypriot President Mehmet Ali Talat claimed “Lokmacı will open soon” through to December 2005 when both Greek and Turkish Cypriot shopkeepers and citizens demanded that the walls and the bridge be torn down and access for pedestrians opened. Interestingly, the newspaper quotes a section of the British High Commissioner, Peter Millet’s announcement that the “Lokmacı problem ... is turned into a daily war of words” which, of course, the media had faithfully, if not over-zealously, kept alight. On 1 January 2006 the Greek Cypriot *Sunday Mail*⁴² led with the headline “Tassos appeals for Turkish Cypriot understanding” and claimed that Papadopoulos “called on the Turkish Cypriots to understand and recognise the justified concerns of the Greek Cypriot side” and that the solution

could only come through the “reunification of our country”. Papadopoulos is quoted as calling on ordinary Turkish Cypriots to “work with us so as to bring down the walls of division” and arguing that “the presence of occupation troops cannot lead to rapprochement, contact and communication”. What the Greek Cypriot President “means” by concepts like “reunification” “our country” and “bringing down walls of division” is not contrasted to what those terms mean to the Turkish Cypriots Papadopoulos addresses, although it is undoubtedly clear to Cypriot journalists and Cypriot media workers in general that there are considerable differences between the two communities’ interpretation of precisely these terms. Another article in the newspaper on the same day⁴³ put forward a challenge (but a challenge to whom?) to change the rhetoric of the Cyprus problem and the Lokmacı/Ledra issue: “But will the rhetoric finally change? Why does it need to? One, because we can’t take it anymore, the scratched record driving us toward insanity ...” however, the author of the article in the Cyprus Mail, Kosta Pavlovitch, goes on: “... but more importantly because ... we are losing control of events, allowing de facto situations to shape the future of this country”. Whereas the Turkish Cypriots consider there to be two distinct and equally sovereign communities in Cyprus working on the process of negotiating a Federal Cyprus settlement, the author of this article, while challenging the rhetorical practices of those in power in the Greek Cypriot community, speaks from the dominant ideological perspective of the Greek Cypriot administration that recognises only one Cyprus that is perceived to be slipping gradually from Greek Cypriot administration’s hands.

The whole media issue of an opening for citizens of both communities to meet together hardened into a frozen paradigm of quoted reaction after reaction to a bridge that has been built on the Turkish Cypriot side of the island. On 4 January 2006 the Turkish Cypriot Afrika⁴⁴ claims “if that bridge had not been put there, by now Lokmacı would have been opened” and “the bridge has hindered the opening ...” while the Greek Cypriot Cyprus Mail⁴⁵ argues that the Greek Cypriot government did not want Ledra Street opened and so “made an issue of the bridge-building and the violation of the buffer zone” in order to stop the process at work in the Turkish Cypriot side. On 15 January, Turkish Cypriot *Kıbrıs*⁴⁶ reported on an interview held by Turkish Cypriot reporter Senem Gök with the Turkish Cypriot leader of pro-solution BDH, Mustafa Akıncı, claiming that from the beginning, the “strong disagreement [about the bridge] was not so obvious” although he already thought that it would be an obstacle for the “old and physically challenged and would be difficult for youngsters carrying their bags”. Akıncı is reported as saying “if I were given the choice ... either open the gate with a bridge or do not open the gate forever, I much prefer the first choice”. Akıncı argued that “We must give preference to the civilian life ... soldiers must, on both parts, withdraw back ... demilitarise the whole of the old city within the walls ... priority to civilians without walls or bridges. This is the right path”. Akıncı’s crucial points are left unchallenged by the journalist,

unquestioned within the context of the story, and thus, hanging without a framework within which readers and citizens might think about them. Moreover, where Akıncı is quoted speaking of the possibility of “choice” the newspaper fails to take up issues related to choices, debate, dialogue and who ultimately decides on issues like these. While the portion of Akıncı’s comments that have been selected by the journalist do speak of a reasonable and rational alternative to what the media has already presented as “the unacceptable status quo”, readers are never informed as to why the state of affairs is currently as it is, nor how to get from there to somewhere else. If there had been any hope at the beginning of January, by the end of the month all hope of the opening of a passage way between the two communities around Lokmacı/Ledra had frozen while the mediated sense of continued underlying currents of conflict and antagonism prevailed.

February Flutters

Following a cold January around the Cypriot media’s Lokmacı/Ledra “event”, Turkish Cypriot Afrika⁴⁷ declared “Lokmacı on agenda again” although the number of articles retrieved had dropped from a December high of 133 to just 12 articles in February. The newspaper reported that the Mayor of Turkish Cypriot Lefkoşa had announced to the Greek Cypriot newspaper Politis that the “stalemate for the last month” was “due to the attitude and tactics followed by the Greek Cypriots”. On 13 February 2006, Turkish Cypriot K/brs⁴⁸ added a new twist to the old story by revealing that the Turkish Cypriot Mayor of Lefkoşa had proposed that “Pedestrians may use the road whereas the bridge may stay there as a monument symbolising the unity of the people.” While mockery was made of this suggestion by both the Turkish and Greek Cypriot press, the Mayor was back in the media limelight two days later with BRT⁴⁹ claiming that “The Mayor of Lefkoşa Kutlay Erk offers unconditional talks for opening new crossing at Lokmacı” while the article explains that “The Greek Cypriot side’s stance prevented the opening of a crossing point at Lokmacı”. On the same day, the Greek Cypriot anglophone newspaper Cyprus Mail⁵⁰ reported the story from a slightly different angle saying that the Turkish Cypriot Mayor “has again signalled the Turkish Cypriot side might be willing to remove the bridge it built” while pointing out that the Mayor had “fallen victim to ridicule as several Turkish Cypriot papers poked fun at comments he made concerning pedestrians ignoring the bridge but keeping it as a monument to the unity of the two Cypriot peoples”. The paper reported “diplomatic sources” saying that “no bi-communal discussions on the crossing were taking place at present” and that the Greek Cypriot Mayor Michalakis Zampellas was “refusing to comment” on the Turkish Cypriot Mayor’s comments to the newspaper but rather “only responding once he had received ‘official information’ on the Turkish Cypriot side’s views”.

On 19 February 2006, the Turkish Cypriot newspaper Afrika⁵¹ seemed to close this chapter of the media story with the headline “No hope for Lokmacı” where it was reported that the Turkish Cypriot Mayor of Lefkoşa, Kutlay Erk stated that “any movement made by the Greek Cypriot side before their forthcoming local elections will be nothing more than image building” and that the “Greek Cypriot side is hiding behind the excuse of demolishing the bridge”. Symptomatic of the whole mediated episode, the reporter claims that when asked what the Greek Cypriot side was doing that might be perceived as “image building” the Mayor “insists not to declare his stance even on the Cyprus question”. This brought the three month media debate to an end without either a resolution to the conflict between different parties or a deeper understanding among the interested publics about what the conflict was actually about.

Major Editorial News Values

When we examine the list of concepts in the column “not news” of the “major editorial values” (See Wolfsfeld’s chart on p. 62), we can find no correlation between this list and the orientation of the articles themselves. None of the articles we have reviewed have dealt with processes, considered long-term policy issues, promoted or reported on calm, highlighted times when there were moments when crisis subdued, periods of cooperation, moods of moderation, accentuated opportunities over drawbacks, highlighted internal consensus or underlined the possibility of incremental progress throughout the period in question. Neither have the articles explored underlying ideological similarities or differences upon which the apparent oppositional positions stand. The appearance of conflict is never presented as multi-sided, neither are the beliefs or pain of the “Other” ever considered. There is, in the synopsis of the media reporting on the Lokmacı/Ledra “event” above, no moment of reflection on the possibility of compromise or hope, perhaps because, as the editorial values chart suggests, this is “not news”.

What we do find instead, is that the news stories concerning the possibility of building community and the opening of avenues for cooperation and understanding consistently undermine the very possibility of hope and bi-communal dialogue – falling squarely into the category considered “newsworthy”. As can be seen below, one primary and key reason for this is that “news” tends to be the selection of events and quotes as defined by elites and privileged sources rather than a sustained and vigorous critique of those sources. Following from this, it becomes clear that the agenda for news storytelling arises from the agenda of those in powerful positions, rather than from the desire to enlighten the citizenry around historically complex issues.

Immediacy

Immediacy refers to the media's focus on actions and events and specifically to examples of where reporting lacks the contextual materials that would allow for reflection and critique. This category is especially important with regard to the Lokmacı/Ledra story because not only is the story itself an event, each twist and turn in the development of the story is also an event or an action: that is, the story is never told as a process in as much as even internally, the developing story never refers back on itself to explore or explain its development – how it came to be where it currently is. Our argument is that journalists and editors are often driven “by” events, perhaps due to the news value of immediacy, even while they (perhaps unwittingly at times) play a crucial role in creating the negative media environment within which audiences are encouraged to think or feel about important social, cultural and political issues.

As the story (which had reached a peak in December of 2005 and plummeted to a measly 17 stories by January of 2006), dissipated without having either provided a clear explanatory framework for thinking about the issue or proffered a reasonable set of explanations for how a “process” or “procedure” or “dialogue” between the communities had come “undone”, we decided to ask editors and columnists of those newspapers why they had dropped the story. Rather than use this category to rehearse examples from newspaper articles already fleshed out above, the comments of editors and journalists concerning the embrace and then sudden rejection of this dynamic story provide additional food for thought. We asked why the story had been dropped so suddenly and without resolution. Below we have cited some of the comments that we received:

- The Chief Editor of Turkish Cypriot Afrika newspaper, Şener [Shener] Levent:⁵² “I am sick and tired writing about the bridge ... presumably we'll return to the subject if something new happens”.
- Loucas Charalambous,⁵³ commentator for Greek Cypriot Politis and the Sunday Mail replied: “I haven't noticed. It seems that it doesn't sell anymore. We have the 'Straw'⁵⁴ problem at the moment and that keeps us busy”.
- Loucas Charalambous⁵⁵ wrote in his column in the Greek Cypriot Politis, 30 March 2006 about a conversation he had concerning the reason for the disappearance of the story from the Cyprus media: “I was at a loss for words when [...] a close friend of mine [...] recently asked me: ‘Have you noticed that suddenly everyone's forgotten about the opening of Ledra Street?’ Why do you think that is? I must confess I had a hard time coming up with a satisfactory answer”.
- Louis Economides,⁵⁶ a veteran Greek Cypriot journalist whose articles are

published in Politis. “We have got new worries now. Everybody is positioning himself to the forthcoming elections. They couldn’t be bothered with bridges and walls. On the other hand, attacking Straw sells more, nowadays. The great majority of the G/Cs do not care less about the opening of the gates”.

- Resat Akar,⁵⁷ Editor of Cyprus’ only tri-language newspaper, Cyprus Dialogue whose articles are also published in Halk’ın Sesi. “Both people and the journalists have lost hope of the opening of the gates. It became obvious that Papadopoulos and his administration are against the opening of new gates. In fact, Papadopoulos is against the solution in Cyprus. People are tired of fighting a lost battle”.
- Başaran Düzgün,⁵⁸ the Chief Editor for Turkish Cypriot Kıbrıs newspaper replied: “It is typical journalistic forgetfulness. When other, more urgent themes became popular, the bridge was forgotten. To be honest, as a person in this business, I was not even aware that we had forgotten until you asked me”.
- Cenk Mutluyakalı,⁵⁹ Chief Editor for the Turkish Cypriot Yenidüzen newspaper commented: “Three reasons come to mind: more than enough was written about the bridge during a certain period. Both the journalists and the readers got bored with it, the long holiday period may have interfered with it, or the bridge itself was out of bounds to the public and journalists were not able to visit it. Mind you, it is not only our newspaper that dropped the story: you don’t see anything on the subject in any of the newspapers. That is most interesting. I wonder why? I shall ask one of our journalists to write a story about the bridge. It is a very expensive bridge so we must not forget it”.
- Akay Cemal,⁶⁰ Chief Editor of Turkish Cypriot Halk’ın Sesi: “It became obvious that the parties cannot and will not agree on the matter and people have lost hope of opening the gate. The visit of Straw became the subject matter and the Lokmacı gate was dropped. It is the result of hopelessness”.

In each of the replies above we have underlined the issue of “immediacy” as related to the category of “events” and “specific actions” where the news value is “novelty” and “animation” rather than the long drawn-out and complex dynamics of process and policy. Editors and journalists alike express surprise and even confusion concerning how and why the story no longer seems to matter or when it might become important again. It is useful to note that while some of the respondents found it difficult to explain why they had dropped the story, they did acknowledge that something else (something new and immediate) had replaced it. Furthermore, they concede that should a new “event” take place again around the issue they will probably pick it up again.

The crucial problem here, and one that drives the issues of drama, simplicity and ethnocentrism as discussed below, is the strong sense in which newspapers “follow” events as they arise. The argument that “we will return to the issue if it arises again”, mystifies the relationship between the editor and the construction of knowledge environments while placing the newspaper in a dependent relationship with the interests of political parties. Rather than “making an issue” out of a complex social problem through questioning and investigative journalism, the editors and journalists await the event being made an issue of “again” by political agencies.

Drama

Drama refers to the juxtapositioning of conceptual frameworks for thinking through responsibilities as a journalist or media industry toward publics whom one (theoretically) serves. Rather than perceiving this category as a purposeful choice on the part of media workers, it can be seen as an environment within which particular choices appear to be more “reasonable”: that is, in environments where the value is toward “being first”, “being fast”, “beating the competition” and “attracting and sustaining the largest audience”, one might “reasonably” prefer violent news headlines over calm ones; crisis over cooperation, discord over consensus.

The story of Lokmacı/Ledra could be (and as we have seen, the newspapers took this route briefly in November 2005) about a “peace breakthrough” and an unusual consensus forming around a bi-communal understanding. However, it is soon necessary to provide explanations for the complexities emerging between the two communities and the multiple points of view that might be at work behind the scenes. At this point, the Cypriot media chose to emphasise conflict rather than the road map toward cooperation and to highlight the extremes that existed within each community rather than those areas where common ground was shared. Furthermore, newspapers presented each small step (or retracing of a step), that might have yielded more explanatory value had it been analysed in the context of previous or possible steps, as a major breakthrough or breaking story on its own. The conflict-orientation increased the tendency in the media to accentuate dangers associated with what might happen to “us” while ignoring completely how “they” perceive dangers associated with what might happen to “them”.

The value of “drama” as a category for reporting is pronounced for both Greek and Turkish Cypriot newspapers. One example of this was when the opening of a pathway between the two communities was transformed suddenly, in the Greek Cypriot press, into a question of “them” encroaching on “our” territory and the potential threat that this would bring to “us”, while the Turkish Cypriot press presented the Greek Cypriot attitude toward the opening of the pathway as a dangerous precedent for “our side.”

Simerini,⁶¹ for example, draws on a statement previously made by Papadopoulos where he “declared that Turks are asking for half of the dead zone” in order to claim:

“The last Turkish provocation at the Ledra Street is a unilateral act of a plan of the invasion forces to re-draw the boundaries ... Turkish Cypriots are enlarging their area of administration close to the dead zone ... the occupational forces are helped in this matter by the foreign powers ... the occupational forces are trying to change the boundaries ... Their provocation at the Ledra Street, at Louroujina village and along the cease-fire line in general are examples of enlarging their area of control.”

While the specific problem revolves around the removal of a wall on the Turkish Cypriot side, only to be replaced by a bridge (with the goal of facilitating the Turkish military personnel in the area) that then becomes an obstacle for the Greek Cypriot side, the newspaper introduces information on the possibility of an “invasion” and a “taking of more land” by the Turkish military that has been “obtained from reliable sources in the government”. Rather than encouraging a thoughtful debate on how to proceed against the unnecessary building of a bridge at Lokmacı/Ledra, the newspaper attempts to create fear among its readers, drawing on images of “invasion” and “occupation” that are already an emotional trigger for the majority of Greek Cypriot citizens.

The Turkish Cypriot *Kıbrıs* uses this same technique of drawing on the quotes from official sources in order to tell a story. *Kıbrıs*⁶² quotes Ferdi Sabit Soyler saying:

“I am calling upon the Papadopoulos administration: He must give up his obstinacy and demolish his wall of division. They have turned the barricade into a place of worship. Let him demolish his taboos and struggle for uniting the two communities on the basis of equality. Let's not become the prisoner of our taboos. Those who become the prisoners of their taboos do not only harm themselves but they also harm their environment.”

This style of reporting not only dramatises events, making them seem imminent when they are actually long, drawn out processes, but mystifies those complexities: what is “the basis of equality” when clearly (or unclearly) the two administrations have differing opinions regarding the ultimate solution to the division of the two communities? Who are the “prisoners of taboos” when both sides are locked into ways of thinking about the past and each other, hindering the rethinking of their relationship for over forty years?

The article continues:

“Our aim is to unite our capital and island by demolishing the wall on the other side. This barricade is the symbol of division and miseries ... this street ... became the main entrance to the South from the Turkish canton of Nicosia upon the Greek attacks with the aim to destroy the partnership status of the “Cyprus Republic.” ... The barricade ... because of the fighting in 1958 and 1963 became the symbol of division, inter-communal struggle and animosity. Recalling the words of Papadopoulos that there is a precipice between the two sides, [Soyer] said that we need to build a bridge to gap the abyss. The bridge here can become a uniting factor for the peoples.”

Because the newspaper story merely “selects” portions of speeches rather than providing critical appraisal of them, the contradictions are left unexamined and the drama of “misery” “attacks” and “destroying partnership” are placed firmly on the “other”. The explicit argument that is left unchallenged here is that the Turkish Cypriot community is wholeheartedly for the reunification of the island’s people while – as the next section quoting Serdar Denктаş confirms: “If they [Greek Cypriots] don’t demolish the wall in their heads they themselves will make the division permanent”. Denктаş is also quoted as saying: “I want to call upon the international community. If you don’t treat equally the two owners of the island, the G/C administration who previously grasped and still holds the rights of the T/Cs, will never accept any solution”.

The story concludes with Soyer’s answer to a question from a foreign journalist: “Our greatest problem is the attitude of the Greek Cypriot leadership. The Greek Cypriot leadership doesn’t want reunification of the island because they do not accept that politically, the Turkish Cypriots are their equal”.

Key issues here that could have been, but never were, raised by journalists who were intent on demystifying the convoluted political style of representation include questions such as: what rights were “previously grasped” by the Greek Cypriot community? How do they “still hold them”? What does “calling on the international community” actually mean? What lies behind the rhetoric of the moment? Who does “two owners” of Cyprus refer to? In what way are “we” ready while “they” are not? The implication above is that the Turkish Cypriots are the victims and the Greek Cypriots the aggressor; there is no space for shared meaning and no possibility of cooperation. The “international community” alone seems to hold the key – and only then if power is exercised over “them”, the Greek Cypriots.

The transformation from a cooperative enterprise between two yielding Cypriot communities in early November had gone through a metamorphosis. For the Greek Cypriots, media represented the impending threat of a Turkish invasion: “Turkish military is encroaching” ... “Turkish Cypriot administration is the puppet of Ankara” ... “Turkish Cypriot military advantage at Ledra” and “The bridge is built on orders

from the Turkish army". At the same moment, the Turkish Cypriot media is flooded with representations of Greek Cypriots as power hungry and uncompromising: "Greek Cypriots want to make us a minority" ... "Greek Cypriot administration preventing a solution" ... "Greek Cypriot reaction is negative" and "The party not cooperating on Lokmacı is the Greek Cypriots".

While brief, this list of drama/crisis oriented reporting on Lokmacı/Ledra is nevertheless a concise representation of the majority of Turkish and Greek Cypriot news stories concerning the probable opening of a path toward more peaceful relations between the two Cypriot communities between November 2005 and February 2006. While there were a few media representations suggesting a general consensus among Greek and Turkish Cypriot shopkeepers and consumers for opening a pathway through the centre of Cyprus' capital city,⁶³ the media reflected instead the antagonisms, the conflict and the possible dangers associated with political shenanigans at the level of elite party politics without any attempt to explain, criticise or critique⁶⁴ the underlying causes of the apparent animosity.

Simplicity

The editorial value of "simplicity", focusing on the paired oppositions of opinion/ideology, image/text, major personalities/institutions, and two-sided conflict/multi-sided conflict, proves instructive and highly enlightening to this present study. Moreover, as we explore the choices consistently made by media workers and media institutions across the island, we notice that these choices also make the possibility of a journalism that can promote peaceful coexistence between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots extremely unlikely at this time. As Ottosen (2004), shows in a study concerning the role of media in providing citizens with the contextualised information necessary for a fuller understanding of a conflict and the possibilities for peace, the media consistently fail to explore the deeper ideological underpinnings of conflict or the "hidden agendas" (p. 13) that may promote a clearer appreciation of the processes at work in an ongoing conflict.

With a primary, indeed addictive compulsion, toward opinion, the image, personalities and the representation of conflict as a two-sided coin (heads wins, tails loses), the media unavoidably heighten conflict, encourage tension and sow discord among readers. The primary tactic of both Turkish and Greek Cypriot journalists appears to be to heighten each community's awareness of the differences between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot leaders in, what amounts to, a zero-sum game, where winning for one necessarily means losing for the other. The media also represent the complex and contradictory positions between multiple actors by reducing them to a game being played out by only two sides, one who is always "right" and the other who is always "wrong": "The problem lies with the Greek Cypriot leader Papadopoulos" or "The Turkish Cypriot leader

Talat is pursuing the opening of the checkpoint on his own terms” or again, “Talat says Papadopoulos is the problem”.

While we do not intend to critique the ideological underpinnings of journalists or media industries in Cyprus here, we agree with Wolfsfeld (2004, p. 21) when he argues that journalists who are unwilling to deal with ideology may severely limit their capacity to engage a peace process. Cypriot media, both Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot have long been acclimatised to the practice of “self-censorship” and the avoidance of speaking directly to the ideological construction of the official state positions with regard to the production and circulation of information within the respective communities on the island. This is a decisive issue and one that should take a central place in future analysis.

Ethnocentrism

Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot media have a long history of demonising each other’s communities and while the demonisation process around the Lokmacı/Ledra event does not take the extreme form that it has taken in the past or may take around other issues or in particular circles, it “makes sense” against a backdrop of over forty-five years of inter-communal, followed by bi-communal “national struggles” where the administrations of each community, supported by their various state controlled and/or “private” media institutions waged psychological “wars of words” against each other and sometimes internally against groups with alternative paradigms. In the case of Lokmacı/Ledra, the demonisation process began as soon as the first obstacle in opening the street appeared. The following examples point toward not only the tendency of newspapers to rely upon official sources for their information, but also on their lack of critical engagement – their refusal to question or to raise concerns around the stories they are told by those sources.

K/br/s⁶⁵ selected comments made by the then Turkish Cypriot Mayor Kutlay Erk in his evaluation of the progress in opening Lokmacı/Ledra:

“If the aim is to open the gate, and our aim is definitely that, we can remove all obstacles for that purpose ... but neither the Greek Cypriot leader nor AKEL is willing to open the gate and they do not want the intermingling of people. They want to keep the division by hiding behind excuses. The aim of Papadopoulos, Christofias, Omirou and the Church is to continue the division of the island and their attitude is proving their racist approach by keeping the city un-united. In contrast, we want to solve the problems through negotiations.”

In reproducing this quotation, K/br/s failed to question the premise upon which the Turkish Cypriot mayor had made his accusations. If the Turkish Cypriot position

is that “all obstacles” can be removed, is not one of those obstacles the barrier of understanding between the two communities? Are the positions of the Greek Cypriot community to be brushed aside as “excuses” – implying that they are not worthy of consideration? Is there only “our way” or “division”? Is it not possible to disagree with “us” and yet, still be for a solution? Is it only the Turkish Cypriot administration that wants to “solve the problems through negotiations”? What is meant by a “racist approach”? Does it mean accenting the “Greek-ness” and “Turkish-ness” of each Cypriot community and, if so, are not both communities then guilty (or innocent) of the charges? In this article, no questions are raised around the official claim that “we” are right while “they” are wrong. For example, the newspaper does not remind the reader that it was the mayor of Nicosia who, after removing a wall, then replaced it with a steel bridge (creating a new “obstacle”?). Instead, the newspaper leaves the reader to assess the claims without recourse to any contextualising material. The article ends:

“Even if we manage to open the gate, as a result of this racist attitude, the gains will be very limited. They desire to leave this city and this country divided. Their vision is either a divided country or a country under the control of the Greek Cypriots. Their policies are based on these racist foundations.”

Even if the Lokmacı/Ledra is opened – that is, even if “they” agree to open the barrier – it will mean nothing because “they” are racists full stop. Thus, a wedge is placed between the Turkish Cypriot reader and any hope of a future settlement with their “racist other”.

Alitheia⁶⁶ published a news item under the heading “Kyprianou: The responsibility is not ours” in which the AKEL spokesperson is quoted as saying:

“The government is definitely not responsible for the Ledra gate if it is not going to be opened. The responsibility rests completely with the occupying army and the Turkish Cypriot leadership in the way it handled the case taking into consideration small party interests. If they try to send falsified information, we must do our best to counter such a stance in the best possible way and be ready for every outcome.”

Alitheia, as K/br/s above, reports this official source without analysis or context leaving the readership to reach their own conclusions. Again the emphasis on “we” being always completely in the right and “them” being always “completely” in the wrong is accented. Furthermore, “their” point of view must be understood as “false” and “we” must counter that with the “truth”. Interestingly, while the newspaper does not take up issues concerning the internal contradictions or alternative points of view within the apparently cohesive “we”, the final paragraph of Kyprianou’s statement does suggest a less than unified position around the issue of the Lokmacı/Ledra:

“I hope that some people will not try to put pressure on the government on this matter and that all political parties with the exception of EDI, will continue supporting the activities of the government.”

Alitheia does not raise any question concerning who “some people” might be or what kind of “pressure” the government might be wary of. Is the reference to “all political parties with the exception of EDI” something to be explained? Is it a reference to expectations from DISY and an effort to keep check on the “official” position of the government? Is there a veiled threat implied in the statement?

In an article in Simerini,⁶⁷ Kornilios Hadjikostas, writing about the Lokmacı/Ledra issue, had this to say:

“The Cypriot wise proverb which says ‘even if a Turk becomes a bridge, do not pass over it’, now has got a literal importance, with the bridge which was built by the occupational regime on the Ledra Street. The hypocrisy, the mockery, the arrogance and the irony/sarcasm of the occupational regime have reached to their zeniths. At the same moment as they are erecting a bridge of division and planning for ‘border stations’, the Turkish Cypriot politicians are throwing carnations in order to complete their well-planned game. Yesterday demonstrations took place, yes, at the presence of the occupational military leadership. What insolence! If it was possible, at that festival, to throw carnations with firearms/cannons, they would have done it.”

To begin, it is clear that the author understands the concept of “Cypriotness” in ethnocentric terms: clearly the “Cypriot wise proverb” is not taken from the stock of “Turkish Cypriot wise proverbs”. While we cannot vouch for the authenticity of the “proverb” it does seem that if it is a “Cypriot” proverb, the “Turk” in the proverb would most likely refer to the “Turkish Cypriots”.⁶⁸ In retrospect the building of a bridge to replace a wall in the Lokmacı/Ledra area was an absurd act and counter to the goal of easing passage for the two communities in the heart of Nicosia. Nevertheless, the article above goes beyond reference to an “act” and focuses primarily on an “ethnicity”. Rather than encouraging a serious debate around a complex politicised engagement between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot authorities, the article demonises and marginalises the value of an entire group. The author goes beyond assigning blame for a policy decision – however ridiculous – and attempts to encourage contempt for an ethnic group. Of course we cannot, with any degree of certainty, assign a sentiment to the “throwing of carnations” from the Turkish Cypriot to the Greek Cypriot side by official representatives of the Turkish Cypriot community, but the article does more than this: it suggests that the underlying motive for the act was violent and evil: “they” would have used “firearms and cannons” if they could get away with it.

Another example drawn from the newspaper stories around Lokmacı/Ledra comes from Yenidüzen⁶⁹ titled “The bridge at Lokmacı will not be pulled down”. The newspaper quotes the leader of the Turkish Cypriot community Mehmet Ali Talat as saying:

“We have to finish our preparations if we want the gate to be opened. We do not have to get permission from anybody for the things that we are doing on our side. Why should we pull down the bridge? The Greek side wants lots of things. What will happen if we do everything they want? The real problem is that they do not want to open the gate. Papadopoulos has asked for demilitarisation and the opening of the gate. That means that he is postponing the opening of the gate since the discussions on demilitarisation will take some time. It may take months or even years. Do I put any conditions [on]to what is happening on the Greek side? Why should they?”

Once again, the newspaper tells the story of the progress being made on the building of relations between the two communities through the antagonistic words from official sources that emphasise “our” rightness and “their” lack of good will. Furthermore, the newspaper story leaves all of the obvious questions unanswered: who is not answerable to the “other side” when the whole enterprise is one of reaching amicable agreement on a settlement? Why is asking for the “demilitarisation” of a shopping district “the real problem”, and more importantly, why is it an “individual” in the form of Papadopoulos that is singled out, rather than an institutional problem between two differing sets of policies over how to proceed? Why does “asking for demilitarisation” mean “that he is postponing the opening of the gate”? Could it not as easily be the refusal to demilitarise that causes the obstacle? Moreover, the question raised in Talat’s quote is never engaged: “Why should we pull down the bridge?” This would certainly be a worthwhile question for any investigative journalist to pursue following the raising of the question by the leader of the community.

The examples taken from the newspapers above around the issue of ethnocentrism and the lost opportunities for providing more complex and contradictory accounts of official positions on the Lokmacı/Ledra issue are far from unique: they represent the norm in reporting in both Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot newspapers.

The central point here is that: “When a peace process breaks down, the news media of both sides emphasise their own righteousness and the other’s evilness. We are always the victims, they are always the aggressors” (Wolfsfeld, 2004, p. 23).

We also agree with Wolfsfeld that “It is difficult to exaggerate the overall impact of this constant flow of ethnocentric information on public perceptions of the enemy.

The news media are extremely powerful and omnipresent mechanisms for intensifying and solidifying hate between peoples” (p. 23).

Reflections on “Peace Journalism”

We have drawn out a general framework within which to reflect upon media stories concerning the Lokmacı/Ledra event and have shown that the stories have consistently fallen into Wolfsfeld’s criteria for “newsworthy” reporting within contemporary configurations of the Cypriot media. With this in mind, it is important to consider the possibility for what Galtung calls “peace journalism” in the context of the pervasive editorial values of news media examined above.

Galtung assumes that “peace journalism” will explore conflict from multiple perspectives, make conflicts transparent, give voice to all concerned parties, see “conflict” as the problem while focusing on creative methods for transforming it, humanise all sides and promote ways of thinking among general publics that will encourage the prevention of violence (or the end of dialogue) before the process reaches a climax. Furthermore, Galtung anticipates that “peace journalism” will expose untruths from all sides, focus on the suffering of marginalised groups, give access to the voiceless in the society, and accentuate the role of ordinary people in the peace-making process rather than the “elites” who tend to be highlighted in contemporary media stories. Finally, Galtung expects “peace journalism” to lend weight to peace initiatives by focusing on the possibilities of a peaceful society and by following through peace initiatives with a focus on resolution, reconstruction and reconciliation. It happens that all of these expectations are firmly rooted in Wolfsfeld’s “not news” category. A few examples will make this point: First, where our analysis reveals the fixation of the Cypriot media on two parties struggling in a zero-sum game to be representative of Wolfsfeld’s “simplicity” category for what constitutes “newsworthiness”, Galtung sees this as “war/violence journalism” and juxtaposes it to the “peace/conflict journalism” where there are many parties, alternative possibilities and issues, and the possibility for all players to benefit by transcending the initial perception of conflict. Second, as we uncovered the tendency of the Cypriot media toward ethnocentrism with an emphasis on “their” brutality and “our” suffering in Wolfsfeld’s “newsworthy” category, Galtung emphasises this as a symptom of “war/violence journalism” and calls for an alternative orientation that accentuates the suffering perpetrated upon and the crime originating from all parties to conflict. Finally, as exemplified in our interviews with editors of Cypriot newspapers, there is a tendency on the part of news industries to drop a story when it is overly complex and time consuming and then return to it when another dramatic event ensues. Most often this is because another event has superseded the primary event and captured the imagination of the news editors. While the propensity for drama (“Major Breakthroughs”) fits concisely with

Wolfsfeld's category of "newsworthy", it finds its place within the "victory-oriented" ("leaving for another war, returning if the old flares up again") subcategory of "war/violence journalism" in Galtung's model. Galtung stresses the need to move from this victory-oriented approach to what he calls "solution-oriented" where journalists follow-through with a story in order to promote the possibility of resolution and reconciliation. Thus, Galtung has essentially challenged the dominant editorial values that constitute contemporary media news industries.

Galtung's call is for nothing less than a revolution in media structures and journalists' performances. Kempf (2003) also highlights the necessity of radical changes in media institutions before journalistic performances change when he argues that for journalists to take on the role of promoting the resolution of conflict and the recognition of alternatives to war, they will have to be emancipated from "... the institutional constraints that result from the criteria for news selection, editorial procedures and expectations, the economics of the media, the connections between the media and the politicians and the military" (p.10).

Concluding Remarks

Clearly, news stories in the Cypriot media generally "follow" political agendas rather than develop independently. They do this mainly through an over-reliance on highly selected quotations that come directly from elite and socially privileged sources. Furthermore, newspapers suggest their own agendas through the "selection" of quotations and their choices in how to present official sources.

The preparing of a clear agenda for the promotion of more engaged and socially conscious knowledge workers is crucial for the future of any possible participatory democracy given the principle role media play in the production and dissemination of information in advanced technological societies (Wolfsfeld, 2004, p. 12).

Naveh (2002) in a study focused on the role of media in the formation of foreign policy similarly highlights the significant role of media in influencing decision makers (p. 10) while First and Avraham (2003), in their study of the role of media in the coverage of conflict, find that the media "... help us consolidate our interpretation of political, social, and economic conflicts" while playing "a similar role in describing the 'Others' of our world" (p. 2). Mowlana (1986)⁷⁰ working on the assumption that the media play a powerful role in shaping media environments and thus contribute to our understanding of and acting in the world, asks "If international media have repeatedly and successfully pursued war-mongering and thereby increased tensions, could they not also do the opposite?" (p. 20).

That the media stand as a gauge against which to measure the state of a particular issue or topic, evaluate the likely implementation of a proposal, and

position oneself as a citizen who is hopeful of a process or disheartened by it, is a prominent characteristic of news reporting. Thus the media play an active role in providing a context for how we think about the political climate surrounding conflict, violence, war and, importantly, initiatives intended to move us toward peace.

The key point here is that as political decision-making becomes more distant from the citizenry, the influence of the media increases. Wolfsfeld's argument echoes similar concerns from communication scholars. Morley and Robins (1995), for example, suggest that "... the further the 'event' from our own direct experience, the more we depend on media images for the totality of our knowledge" (p. 133).

Our concern has been to explore the public media debate on the Cyprus conflict through a frame provided by a synthesis of both peace and critical communication oriented scholarship – drawing from contemporary examples of Cypriot media representations, some sense of how institutionally situated journalists are currently engaging in conflict-oriented rather than conflict-resolving journalistic practices. This is all the more necessary because scholars and students of such fields as political science, international relations and communication studies – and indeed the citizenry in general – invariably turn to this readily accessible stream of press releases and media channels in the form of the world wide web, newspapers, television programmes, magazines and radio stations, and extract from these reports, parameters within which to think about and offer possible solutions to the "Cyprus Problem".

Clarifying the role that the Cypriot media play in the construction of stories that help to shape our general understanding of the current situation in Cyprus accentuates the fact that reports about statements or comments made by either one's own or "the others" political representatives or processes, are not the statements or processes themselves but rather media representations that have been shaped for public consumption by the media industries. Rather than being witnesses to the "Cyprus conflict" itself, we are rather witnessing carefully orchestrated "media wars" where media highlight and re-present social, cultural, political and economic dynamics in and between the two Cypriot communities in selective and ideological forms: as "win-lose" or "conflict driven".

Having recognised the tendency toward conflict-oriented news production in the Cypriot media, the challenge now is to begin a process of identifying alternative sources of journalism within and beyond the Cypriot mainstream media and the necessary ground upon which to develop and support an alternative journalism⁷¹ that, contrary to contemporary Cypriot newsroom policy, represents social and political life in terms of how it might promote social justice, reconciliation, and the resolution of conflict through creative and peaceful means.

- * **POSTSCRIPT:** Following the completion of this study, dramatic events reshaped the political landscape in Cyprus. On 24 February 2008, Demetris Christofias was elected as the new President of the Republic of Cyprus. One month later the leaders of the two communities, Christofias and Talat, met and agreed to remove the obstacles to the opening of the street. On 3 April 2008, following years of sensational journalism that most often spoke in disparaging and negative terms concerning the possibility of cooperation and compromise, Ledra/Lokmacı opened making it possible for Greek and Turkish Cypriots to meet once again in the heart of Nicosia's Old City.

Notes

1. The capital city of Cyprus is referred to by Turkish Cypriots as Lefkoşa and Greek Cypriots as Lefkosia. We will use these two terms respectively when referring to arguments emanating from their communities and we will use the English language term "Nicosia" when making our own comments in the text.
2. This refers to the recent debates over the future shape of Cyprus. The Greek Cypriot ruling elite argues for the maintenance of the Republic of Cyprus and the Turkish Cypriot administration voted in favour of a new bi-zonal, bi-communal federated structure. This new structure, envisaged by the UN plan necessitates the diminution of the present Republic of Cyprus to "constituent state" status within a new Federal Republic of Cyprus. This most recent attempt at building a "partnership Republic" finds its roots in the 1950s struggle of the Greek Cypriot community for Enosis (union with Greece) which was transformed significantly, after an attempted Greek Coup in 1974, into a celebration of an independent Greek Cypriot State with a recognised Turkish Cypriot minority. In parallel with the movement for Enosis, the Turkish Cypriot community argued for Taksim (the creation of two separate sovereign states – one Greek, the other Turkish). The Turkish Cypriots rejected the Taksim "solution" in the UN sponsored referendum when they voted in favour of a new United Federal Republic of Cyprus with two constituent states while the Greek Cypriots overwhelmingly rejected the UN plan.
3. The prominent G/C newspapers published in the last two decades of the nineteenth century: *Kypros* [Cyprus], *Neon Kytion* [New Citium], *Keravnos* [Thunderbolt], *Ethnos* [The Nation] published in Larnaka; *Alitheia* [The Truth], *Salpinx* [The Trumpet], *Anayennisis* [Renaissance] published in Limassol; *Phoni Tis Kyprou* [The Voice of Cyprus], *Symea Tis Kyprou* [The Flag of Cyprus], *Empros* [Forward], *Eleftheria* [Freedom], *Patris* [The Motherland] published in Nicosia; *Salamis*, *Ammochostos* (Famagusta), *Aghon* [The Struggle], *Eon* [The Age] published in Paphos. (Andreas Sophocleus (1993) *Ta Mesa Mazikis Enimerosis Stin Kyprou*, Nicosia. pp. 11-13).
4. The newspapers published in Turkish at the same period: *Ümid* [Hope] published in Larnaka; *Sa'ded* [The Scope] published in Limassol; *Zaman* [The Times], *Yeni Zaman* [The New Times], *Kıbrıs* [Cyprus], *Mirat-ı Zaman* [The Mirror of the Time] published in Nicosia. (Azgın (1988), pp. 641-643).
5. At that time, of course, the issue was between Greek Cypriots arguing for union of

Cyprus with Greece and Turkish Cypriots claiming that Cyprus legally belonged to the Ottoman state and that, should Britain decide to vacate the island, it should be handed back to its legal owner.

6. The term Lokmacı “gate” or “barricade” was most often used by the Turkish Cypriot media while the term “Ledra Street” was most often used by the Greek Cypriot media in reference to the same geographical location in the heart of the walled city in the capital Nicosia. Further, Ledra Street, in Greek is “Makridhromos” and in Turkish is “Uzun Yol” with both meaning “the long road”. The Lokmacı barricade was demolished by the Turkish Cypriot administration with a view to reuniting the two sides of Nicosia in November 2005, however the Greek Cypriots objected to the building of a bridge where the Lokmacı barricade had been on the Turkish Cypriot side and refused to demolish the wall on their side of Ledra Street until the bridge was removed.
7. Continuous, extensive and often passionate coverage of the opening of the borders between the two Cypriot communities, the election of the CTP/DP coalition government in northern Cyprus, the election of Mehmet Ali Talat to the Presidency of northern Cyprus, the election of Papadopoulos and Akel to power in southern Cyprus, the simultaneous referendums on the UN-sponsored “Annan Plan” with Greek Cypriots voting against it and Turkish Cypriots voting for it and the subsequent entry of the Greek Cypriot administered Republic of Cyprus into the European Union in May 2004.
8. Following the developing story on the Lokmacı/Ledra issue places us at the centre of the historical separation of the two communities during periods that have become important to both: the late 1950s and between 1963 and 1974 for the Turkish Cypriots who were protecting themselves from the Greek Cypriot struggle toward Enosis during that time; and 1974 for Greek Cypriots who consider the invasion of Cyprus by one of their Guarantor States, Turkey, as the starting point of inter-communal conflict. Also, following media representations of the potential opening of this border between the two communities in the capital city of Nicosia after forty years of separation, offers a glimpse into the more general complexities of opening the island cultures to a truly bi-communal, bi-zonal Federation and the role that the Cypriot media might reasonably be expected to play (in its present form) in promoting such a peace or inculcating and heightening conflict.
9. The emphasis on the lines – “giving voice to all parties; empathy, understanding and “us-them” journalism, propaganda, voice for “us” – is on peace journalism “giving voice to all parties” and war journalism giving “voice for us”. Galtung’s original chart can be found at: [http://globalmedia.emu.edu.tr/fall2006/Fall_2006_Issue2/1Johan_Galtungpdf.pdf.]
10. This is also true for the line “more so the worse the weapon”. The point here is that peace oriented journalism will accent humanisation more when the situation is worse, whereas war oriented journalism will fan the flames more when the situation is worse.
11. The Lokmacı barricade was a wall that closed off access to Ledra Street until December 2005 when the Turkish Cypriots demolished it with a view to reuniting the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot sides of the Capital city of Nicosia. There was also a wall on the Greek Cypriot side of the dead zone which was demolished one year later at the end of 2006. Although the walls were demolished, the gate remains closed at the time of writing.

12. [www.financialmirror.com/more_news.php?id=2498].
13. [www.brt.gov.nc.tr/] accessed on 23 November 2005.
14. [www.pio.gov.cy] Turkish Press and Other Media No. 224/05 24 November 2005.
15. Cyprus Mail, 25 November 2005.
16. [<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,13509-1890026,00.HTML>].
17. Observers who followed the “story” would have been aware that soon after the UN sponsored referenda the Greek Cypriot government, in order to soften the negative international fallout from their “No vote”, had proposed to open 12 new crossing points between north and south Cyprus. Later it was decided that for practical purposes the crossings would be opened one at a time. Subsequently, there was much wrangling between the two administrations over which crossing should be opened first. The priority of the Turkish Cypriots was the Bostancı/Zotia gate whereas the Greek Cypriot preference was to start with the Lokmacı/Ledra gate. Finally, the Turkish Cypriot administration opened the Bostancı/Zotia crossing unilaterally and thus the problem was solved. It is feasible to assume that the Turkish Cypriot administration was attempting to use the same tactics at Lokmacı when the Greek Cypriot administration interrupted their activities. The Turkish Cypriot Mayor of Lefkoşa had announced that he would open the crossing at Lokmacı on Christmas day and celebrate the opening by distributing ‘lokmas’ to those who crossed on that day. The Greek Cypriot administration formally protested to the UN and requested that the celebration not be allowed to take place.
18. [www.brt.gov.nc.tr] archived 26 November 2005.
19. [www.cypriusmirror.com/?newsid=2411&category=].
20. By this time the “Lokmacı barricade” had become a “bridge” as the Turkish Cypriot authorities had demolished the wall and replaced it with a bridge that would serve both to allow military personnel to pass beneath it and Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot civilians to pass over it. The Greek Cypriot administration was protesting against the bridge and calling for its removal from the street while the Turkish Cypriot administration claimed that the Greek Cypriot administration was only using the bridge as an excuse for not demolishing their wall at the far side of Ledra Street.
21. Simerini, 2 December 2005. “They opened roads for Attila”.
22. Simerini, 5 December 2005. “The division of the deadzone”. Michalis Papadopoulos.
23. Simerini, 7 December 2005. “Even if a Turk becomes a bridge”.
24. [www.brt.gov.nc.tr] archived 8 December 2005.
25. *Kıbrıs*, 8 December 2005. Article by Hasan Hastürer “It seems that nobody will pass the Lokmacı Exam”.
26. [www.observercyprus.com/politics.htm] 9 through 15 December 2005.
27. Simerini, 10 December 2005. “The Ledra Street”. Nikos Tornarides.
28. Politis, 13 December 2005.
29. Haravgi, 15 December 2005. “They should not ruin the common vision” (Editorial).
30. *Kıbrıs*, 15 December 2005. Article by Ali Baturay.
31. Simerini, 15 December 2005. Article by Kostakis Antoniou.

32. Yenidüzen, 16 December 2005. "The bridge at Lokmacı will not be pulled down".
33. Alitheia, 18 December 2005. "Kiprianou: The responsibility is not ours".
34. [www.brt.gov.nc.tr] archived on 19 December 2005.
35. Phileleftheros, 18 December 2005. "Ledra Street as a symbol of Turkish arbitrariness".
36. Phileleftheros, 21 December 2005. "Free commuting through Ledra" [Opinion of Phileleftheros].
37. Afrika, 25 December 2005 "Unilateral celebrations are good for nothing".
38. [www.cyprus-mail.com] "We don't need the Ledra Bridge", archived on Friday, 30 December 2005.
39. Greek Cypriots had placed depictions at Ledra Palace crossing point from the Dherinia incident where two Greek Cypriots had been killed. The Turkish Cypriot administration called for their removal.
40. Phileleftheros, 31 December 2005.
41. K/br/s, 1 January 2006 "Summary of the Year".
42. Sunday Mail, 1 January 2006 "Tassos appeals for Turkish Cypriot understanding". Jean Christou.
43. Sunday Mail, 1 December 2006. "A growing malais" Costa Pavlovitch.
44. Afrika, 4 January 2006. "Letter from Afrika".
45. [www.cyprus-mail.com] "Meritocracy goes mad", archived in "Tales from the Coffee Shop" 8 January 2006.
46. K/br/s, 15 January 2006. "The Greek Cypriots want to gain ground, Turkey wants to gain time".
47. Afrika, 2 February 2006 "Lokmacı on agenda again".
48. K/br/s, 13 February 2006. "Erk: Pedestrians can use the road and the bridge may stay as a monument".
49. [www.brt.gov.nc.tr] 15 February 2005.
50. Cyprus Mail, 15 February 2006. "Erk: No red lines on Ledra Street".
51. Afrika, 19 February 2006. "No hope for Lokmacı".
52. Personal interview on 14 January 2006.
53. Personal interview on 17 January 2006.
54. Britain's Foreign Secretary Jack Straw's upcoming 26 January visit to northern Cyprus had taken priority over the Lokmacı barricade/Ledra Street story as the Greek and Turkish Cypriot media's latest "event" in January 2006. Straw had agreed to meet the Turkish Cypriot President Mehmet Ali Talat at his presidential offices in the Turkish part of Lefkoşa to the distain of the Greek Cypriot administration as they argued it was tantamount to "recognising" the Turkish Cypriot leader. Greek Cypriot media carried stories of angry confrontations between Straw and Greek Cypriots who demanded that he refuse to meet with Talat although he ultimately did.
55. Politis, 30 March 2006.
56. Personal interview, 27 January 2006.

57. Personal interview, 27 January 2006.
58. Telephone interview on 18 January 2006.
59. Telephone interview on 18 January 2006.
60. Personal interview on 18 January 2006.
61. Simerini, 18 December 2005. "They are applying the Annan Plan as it suits them".
62. *Kbr/s*, 7 December 2005. "Give up your obstinacy and demolish your wall".
63. While representations of the desire for cooperation were few indeed, they do point both toward the media's selection process – what could count as 'news' – and to the possibility that alternative ways of thinking about and evaluating the conflict are actually possible. For example, *Africa* published an article on 12 December 2005 reporting that "T/C Shopkeeper Association, yesterday, organized a meeting at the Lokmaci barricade and demanded the opening of the Lokmaci gate at the earliest possible time" and again on 6 January 2006 quoting a Greek Cypriot shopkeeper, Savas Lemonaris arguing that "I buy materials for 'ekmek kadayafi' from the North. If this gate was opened, life would have been much easier". Again, in an article published in *Alitheia*, on 18 December 2005: "Tens of Greek Cypriots representing 'Citizens for the Opening of Ledra Street' accompanied by the Turkish Cypriot representatives of 'This Country is Ours' gathered at the Eleftheria Square and then marched to the Ledra barricade on the Green Line where speeches were delivered".
64. The use of the phrase "criticise or critique" is intentional – "criticise" here means to "object to the way that political elites polarise dialogue", and "critique" means to "contextualise the debate by uncovering the way in which political elites polarise dialogue".
65. *Kbr/s*, 13 February 2006. "Pedestrians can use the road and the bridge may stay as a monument".
66. *Alitheia*, 18 December 2005. "Kyprianou: The responsibility is not ours".
67. Simerini, 7 December 2005. "Even if a Turk becomes a bridge" by Kornilios Hadjickostas.
68. Simerini, 8 December 2005. "The Right Rapprochement". Kornilios Hadjickostas wrote the following day in Simerini that his article referred not to the "simple Turkish Cypriots with whom we are invited to live together, but the occupational regime and the Turkish politicians".
69. *Yenidüzen*, 16 December 2005. "Talat: The bridge at Lokmaci will not be pulled down".
70. Cited in: Becker, J. (2004) 'Contributions by the media to crisis prevention and conflict settlement' in: *Conflict and Communication Online*, Vol. 3, No. 1/2, p. 4. [www.cco.regener-online.de], ISSN 1618-0747.
71. A key point here and one that needs to be engaged and explored in depth is that – as Manoff (1998) argues: "... journalism is a specific social practice that has a history, and ... this history is one of unending social invention. In other words, in discussing 'media and conflict' issues, it is important not to fall prey to an a-historical essentialism that presumes that today's form of journalism is, or ought to be, tomorrow's" (p. 37). Freeing ourselves from the assumption that contemporary configurations of media industries and journalistic practices are somehow "natural outcomes" of the development of

technological and institutional structures is crucial to a more flexible approach in rethinking the potential role of the journalist toward conflict resolution and peace building.

Bibliography

- Azgin, B. (1998) 'The Turkish Cypriot Mass Media' in Grothusen, K.D., Steffani, W. and Zervakis, P. (eds.), *Zypern. Göttingen/Zürich*, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, pp. 641-659.
- Blasi, B. (2004) 'Peace Journalism and the News Production Process', *Conflict and Communication Online*, Vol. 3, No. 1/2.
- Calabrese, A. and Sparks, C. (2005) *Toward a Political Economy of Culture: Capitalism and Communication in the Twenty-first Century*. Oxford, Rowmann and Littlefield.
- Entman, R.M. (2004) *Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion, and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Chicago, Chicago University Press.
- First, A. and Avraham, E. (2003) 'Changes in the Political, Social and Media Environments and their Impact on the Coverage of Conflict: The Case of the Arab Citizens of Israel'. *Conflict and Communication Online*, Vol. 2, No. 1.
- Galtung, J. (2002) 'Peace Journalism: A Challenge' in Kempf, W. and Loustarinen, H. (eds.), *Journalism and the New World Order*, Vol. 2: *Studying the War and the Media*. Gothenburg, Nordicom.
- Kempf, W. (2003) 'Constructive Conflict Coverage: A Social-psychological Research and Development Program' in *Conflict and Communication Online*, Vol. 2, No. 2.
- Lazar, A. and Lazar M.M. (2004) 'The Discourse of the New World Order: Outcasting the Double Face of Threat', *Discourse and Society*, Vol. 15, No. 2/3, pp. 223-242.
- Lynch, J. and McGoldrick, A. (2005) *Peace Journalism*. England, Hawthorn Press.
- Mandelzis, L. (2003) 'The Changing Image of the Enemy in the News Discourse of Israeli Newspapers, 1993-1994', *Conflict and Communication Online*, Vol. 2, No.1.
- Manoff, R. (1998). "'Role plays": Potential Media Roles in Conflict Prevention and Management' in *The Role of Media in Conflict Prevention, Conflict Management and Peace Building: An Overview of Theory and Practice*. Commissioned by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands and the Netherlands Association of Journalists in 2002.
- McChesney, R. and Hackett, R.A. (2005) 'Beyond Wiggle Room: American Corporate Media's Democratic Deficit, Its Global Implications, and Prospects for Reform' in Hackett, R.A. and Zhao, Y. (eds.), *Democratizing Global Media: One World, Many Struggles*. Oxford, Rowmann and Littlefield, pp. 225-244.
- Morley, D. and Robins, K. (1995) *Spaces of Identity: Global Media, Electronic Landscapes and Cultural Boundaries*. New York, Routledge.
- Mosco, V. (2006) 'Citizenship Works', *Global Media Journal: Mediterranean Edition*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Spring), pp. 17-28.

- Mosco, V. and Reddick, A. (1997) 'Political Economy, Communication and Policy' in Bailie, M. and Winseck, D. (eds.), *Democratizing Communication: Comparative Perspectives on Information and Power*. New Jersey, Hampton Press.
- Mowlana, H. (1986) *Global Information and World Communication: New Frontiers in International Relations*. New York, Longman.
- Naveh, C. (2002) 'The Role of the Media in Foreign Policy Decision-making: A Theoretical Framework', *Conflict and Communication Online*, Vol. 1, No. 2.
- Ottosen, R. (2004) 'The Norwegian Media Image of the War in Afghanistan: Peace Keeping or Aggression?' in *Conflict and Communication Online*, Vol. 3, No. 1/2.
- — — (1995) 'Enemy Images and the Journalistic Process', *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 1, pp. 1-16.
- Sophocleous, A.CI. (2006) 'The First Cypriot Newspapers and the British Administration', *Global Media Journal: Mediterranean Edition*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Spring) [<http://globalmedia.emu.edu.tr>].
- Sophocleous, A. (1993) *Ta Mesa Mazikis Enimerosis Stin Kyprou* [Mass Media in Cyprus]. Nicosia.
- Shinar, D. (2004) 'Media Peace Discourse: Constraints, Concepts and Building Blocks', in *Conflict and Communication Online*, Vol. 3, No. 1/2.
- Wolfsfeld, G. (2004). *Media and the Path to Peace*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

READING THE PARATEXTS OF THE CYPRUS CONFLICT: POLICY, SCIENCE, AND THE PURSUIT OF ‘OBJECTIVITY’*

Olga Demetriou

Abstract

This article addresses the way in which ‘the Cyprus conflict’ post-1974 has been constructed in studies that straddle the academic/political divide. Since their inception, analyses of the Cyprus conflict have striven to produce accounts that are insightful, impartial, yet at the same time engaged. The article focuses on authors who have had an impact on wider Greek-Cypriot public perceptions beyond academia and analyses their treatment of impartiality and engagement. What such works have in common, the article suggests, is the fact that they attempt to navigate the space between political analysis and political involvement, and therefore, the tension between impartiality and engagement is of primary importance in the interpretation of the discourse each deals with. Genette’s concept of ‘paratexts’ is used to argue that strategies of managing the tension between impartiality and engagement as well as further tensions arising from it are evident in paratextual material, emphasising what perhaps might not be directly stressed in the text.

Keywords: textual analysis, the politics of objectivity, epistemology, Cyprus conflict, paratext, paraliterature

But just as, in the present state of History, any political mode of writing can only uphold a police world, so any intellectual mode of writing can only give rise to a para-literature, which no longer dares speak its name.

Roland Barthes, *Writing Degree Zero* (Barthes, 1999 [1953], p. 28)

Introduction

The concept of objectivity has been at the heart of postmodernist debate since its inception, and the conclusion that no analysis can be completely impartial no matter how scientific, long considered foregone. From this debate emerged a figure of the reliable/truthful scientist as one who is aware of their partiality and makes this awareness part of their commitment to science. Through acknowledging that this

possibility is probably the most promising avenue for academic debate to continue making inroads through increasingly complex questions, this article seeks to examine different forms in which acknowledgment of such partiality may take. By looking at both academic and more lay studies of the Cyprus conflict post-1974, it argues that despite such differences, when it comes to analyses of highly politicised issues such as this, one question that eludes the debate is the extent to which understandings of 'partiality' are intertwined with the choice between adopting the views of one or the other side. Without claiming impartiality for itself therefore, the article seeks merely to provide a critical assessment of how partiality due to an author's ethnic origins comes to be considered self-evident in vastly divergent works in the field which have in differing ways had an impact on the Greek-Cypriot public domain.

The Paratext as Threshold of Negotiation

Literary and cultural studies generally intersect on the theme of the production and reception of texts, with cultural norms or discourse being read as text.¹ Yet the importance of textual material in social research calls for a need to pay more attention to the social science text as text.² This article is the outcome of such an effort, where texts on the Cyprus problem, which have arisen out of a political science methodology (albeit applied in different forms) were examined for their treatment of the separation/cross-fertilisation between politics and science.³

The article deals with studies that exemplify this cross-fertilisation. While both 'politics' and 'science' have multiple meanings that span a range of concepts my primary aim in looking at these texts is to look for the ways in which the authors try to steer a course in the gap between being engaged researchers (and therefore, in different ways, 'doing politics') and being objective researchers (and, in different ways, 'doing science'). In addressing this issue, I borrow from literary theory to argue that the best place to uncover the link between ideological and scientific discourse is the paratext – that is, the text beside the text. In this way, the article explores the ways in which paratextual material belies the 'objectivity' that some of these scholarly texts purport to uphold. This is symptomatic, I further argue, of what, taken to the extreme, may be called a para-literature, whereby political and intellectual modes of writing interlace each other perpetuating the political discursive conflict on the level of analysis, including academic analysis. In other words, I try to explore what it is 'in the present state of Cypriot History' (to paraphrase Barthes) that renders analyses of politics political projects in themselves. In this process I examine the paratext as a device that helps uncover the structures through which the tension between politics and analysis is maintained.

According to Gerard Genette, 1997 [1987] the paratext is all that surrounds the main text: including titles, prefaces, footnotes, pseudonyms, and illustrations. My application of the notion here returns the 'paratext' from the literary to its socio-political context, from which Genette appears to have been inspired:

"like in the words *parafiscal* and *paramilitary* the prefix suggests a threshold", he explains, "[it] indicates at once proximity and distance, similarity and difference, interiority and exteriority ... a thing which is situated at once on this side and on that of a frontier, of a threshold or a margin, of equal status and yet secondary, subsidiary, subordinate, like a guest to his host, a slave to his master" (Genette, 1991, 271n).

It constitutes

"a zone not just of transition but of transaction ... [Because it is] more or less legitimated by the author, [it is] the privileged site of a pragmatics and of strategy, of an action on the public in the service, well or badly understood and accomplished, of a better reception of the text and a more pertinent reading – more pertinent, naturally, in the eyes of the author and his allies" (*ibid.*, pp. 261-262).

In other words, the politics of the paratext rests on the authorial power guiding the practice of reading. In texts belonging to genres of social science, I would propose that the threshold the paratext marks is often that of objectivity. At stake in this politics is therefore the legitimation of the author's point of view as objective. This threshold of objectivity, I want to argue, is a conscious negotiation on the part of the authors between their own understanding of their subjective positioning and that of the objective analysis they are expected to present. In the texts I examine this negotiation is particularly pertinent because subjective positioning is not necessarily viewed in negative terms, but rather in terms of 'engagement'⁴ – an engagement which is often presented as enhancing the insights presented. Thus, the paratext acts as the author's first gauge of 'objectivity' and 'engagement' in the text's journey into the public sphere.

Indeed, while this negotiation may also be found in the text *per se*, I would argue that the paratext is particularly interesting to look at because it is here that certain rules of formality or style can be transgressed. For example, in the dedication or acknowledgments text (see below) the 'author' is transformed into a social person with familial, friendship, or professional connections. In the footnotes one can relegate overly technical and/or predominantly personal information. In this information the negotiation between objectivity and engagement that is often already imbued in the text is made more apparent. This negotiation, I argue, lies at the heart of most political science studies of the Cyprus conflict and has by now become the characteristic of a discourse one might even call 'para-literary'.

Para-literary Politics and Cyprus

Barthes argues that “power or conflict ... produce the purest modes of writing” (1999, p. 20) where language signifies commitment above all (ibid., pp. 26-28). Para-literature comes into being when intellectual and political modes of writing find themselves “in a complete blind alley ... [leading] only to complicity or impotence, which means, in either case, alienation” (ibid., p. 28), i.e. of literature from its power and writers from the social conditions they write about. This concept of ‘para-literature’ is useful in pointing out the processes through which a conflict-centred discourse is led into such ‘blind alleys’.

In this sense, the Cyprus conflict can be said to have given rise to modes of writing that have made ‘purity’ seem impossible in the sense that the language of science (signified by ‘hard facts’) is underpinned by political commitments focused on the cause of an imagined ‘solution’ to the conflict. This is not, however, solely the case only in the social sciences. Archaeologists and historians for example have argued for Greek or Turkish origins of the island and its people in antiquity (Karageorghis, 1982; Ortayli, 2007). On the other hand, seeking to break with this legacy, new forms of writing have appeared that instead abdicate the academic debate and seek to break out of the ‘blind alley’ using humour and ridiculing those ‘hard facts’, while equally guided by the imagination of a(nother) ‘solution’ (Papadakis, 2005). What seems problematic is not necessarily the lack of ‘pure’ literature which, I would argue against Barthes, is untenable. It is rather the fact that despite analysts’ best efforts to answer the engagement/objectivity conundrum for decades now, Cypriot conflict studies are still plagued by the equation between partiality and ethnic origin.

This is not to say that such efforts have been futile. A number of discursive devices and themes pervading the literature have indeed been insightfully scrutinised. As recently pointed out, analyses of the Cyprus problem are often driven by the question of ‘who is to blame’ (Papadakis, 2005, p. xiii). Alternatively, they may rest their explanatory power on analytic concepts that appear to be, but are not, value-free. These may be terms that conflict-resolution analysts have called ‘trigger words’, the prime example being ‘invasion’ and ‘peace operation’ (Bowman, 2006, p. 124). Yet, less obvious terms can also serve this function: ‘partition’ and ‘border’ designate conditions on the ground that actors in the conflict may interpret as pertaining to state-hood and thus argue against or in favour (‘border’ for the Greek-Cypriot leadership means a ‘state border’, it can never convey a concept such as ‘mental border’ and is thus an unacceptable description for the Green Line). Even concepts such as ‘democracy’, ‘law’, or the ‘international system’ (and of course, not least, ‘peace’) become part of a rhetoric that adheres to specific ways of interpreting the situation and thus become laden with meaning. The making of

such discourses has been the focus of many studies of the conflict (Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis and Trigeorgis, 1993; Bryant, 2001; Constantinou and Papadakis, 2001; Demetriou, 2005; Ramm, 2006; Diez, 2002; Anastasiou, 2002). My point here is not to reiterate these but to emphasise that these prejudgments (in the Gadamerian sense) attend not only nationalist (or even non-nationalist) political rhetoric but also political analysis. Indeed, such prejudgments may be orally unpicked in informal settings but have not seriously been studied in depth, a failure, I would suggest that has somehow helped to render them 'expected', thus naturalising the equation between a researcher's ethnic origins and their prejudgments. Even though the analysis here does not aim to go into this in depth, I do want to show that these prejudgments are evident even in the paratexts of such studies, the objective of which is ultimately the authors' validation of their own subjective point of view.

The texts I focus on are exemplary because throughout the four decades that they span (concentrating the selection to analyses of the post-1974 situation) they have acquired a special place as academic texts in the (primarily Greek-) Cypriot public sphere, a place at the cusp between analysis and political intervention. Because of their placement there, their negotiation of objectivity and engagement becomes doubly pertinent. It is telling of the variability of understanding of these concepts that the main referent of the title in all of them is Cyprus – a signifier wide enough to cover the objectivity of 'truth' ('Cyprus' as a knowable entity) and engagement of ownership (the author's 'Cyprus' as knowledge to impart). The choice of the books presented below is thus guided by a concern to present an indicative sample – it by no means purports to be unique or irreplaceable by others' texts. However as an indicative sample of what has been produced by and through academic discussions on the Cyprus conflict that has crossed over (to variable degrees admittedly) into public debate and policy, the set of texts below covers a wide number of variables. The authors, Michael Attalides, David Hannay, Christopher Hitchens, Niyazi Kızılyürek, and Kypros Chrysostomides, have all played a role in the Greek-Cypriot public political sphere, intentionally or not, yet have all had different kinds of attachments to the Greek-Cypriot community. The texts discussed have all marked important points in their authors' careers yet were written in vastly different political junctures (and it is this quality as substantive texts of argumentation that classifies them apart from other works such as journal articles where similar negotiations may take place). The arguments are all ultimately guided by particular ideologies regarding the solution to the problem, yet come at their conclusions from the perspectives of different fields of expertise and modes of writing. It is in this sense an interesting fact that Hannay's memoir work, Hitchen's journalistic style and Kızılyürek's attempt at initiating public intellectual debate can be compared to Attalides' sociological study or Chrysostomides' legal treatise. Finally, they may have been intended for different audiences, local or foreign, academic and not, yet they have all become indispensable references to Cyprus

conflict studies.⁵ It is all the more important to note that such referencing spans the various classifications one may choose for such studies: disciplinary, politically-oriented, or theme-driven. It is primarily these aspects of comparison that make the different ways of balancing engagement and objectivity in these different 'Cypruses' particularly interesting.

Versions of Cyprus

The International Politics of Engagement

Attalides' seminal work (Attalides, 1979) serves as a good starting point because of its strict objectivism that leaves little room for the objectivity/engagement negotiation I outlined above. The title *Cyprus: Nationalism and International Politics*, while free of the linguistic witticism adopted by later writers, which often hint at ideological standpoints (compare, for example Hitchens' alliterative *Hostage to History* dealt with below or more recently O'Malley and Craig's *The Cyprus Conspiracy*), is nevertheless geared towards answering the same key question of assigning blame for the 'current state of affairs' (understood in 1979, and from a Greek-Cypriot perspective, as the geographical division that followed the war). And while the author goes to great lengths to steer away from simplified answers, even suggesting that Cypriot nationalism is composed of three different types instead of being a straightforward phenomenon, its paratexts would suggest otherwise.

Thus, while the introduction strives to complicate hitherto-espoused explanations for the benefit of precise analysis, its highpoint is the castigation of an *Economist* journalist for their "simple ... unsophisticated ... attribution of causality" when claiming that the 1974 war was the result of "harassment of the Turkish minority by the Greek majority in the 1960s" (*ibid.*, p. x), suggesting that perhaps the book is also a native attempt to rectify foreigners' misconceptions about the problem. In these short lines the researcher becomes 'engaged' and argues in favour for this engagement by pointing out how the findings of the study may be applied. Yet, he stakes this engagement on his native, Greek-Cypriot, identity.

This is mirrored in other paratextual material. The cover of the 2003 re-print (Attalides, 2003) was transformed (one assumes by the publisher) from a questionably neutral map of the island reminiscent of the flag of the Republic minus the olive branch of the 1979 original into a much more politically explicit statement of who is to blame. It consists of a photo showing Archbishop Makarios in amicable conversation with Henry Kissinger, the US Secretary of State in 1974, who personifies for a number of writers, journalists, and Greek-Cypriot lobby groups the face of US responsibility of the north's occupation by Turkish troops.⁶ Indeed Kissinger's statements are cited in the conclusions as exemplary of the shady US policy on Cyprus (*ibid.*, pp. 188-191). In a text concerned primarily with tracing the

history of the division using concrete sociological data – a highlight being table three showing the rise in the total number of Turkish and Greek villages and the decline of mixed ones during the twentieth century (*ibid.*, p. 89) – this ending chapter is one of the few places where the author’s personal stake in explaining the conflict (and finding a way out of it) is explicitly acknowledged:

“An involved observer with some training in detachment cannot wait for the statesmen and politicians to open their archives before attempting to interpret the maiming of a minor but important society ... [the facts] present evidence of the dangers to humanity, particularly to that part of it that lives in small and defenceless states and of the arrogantly destructive consequences of the ways in which the dominant of ‘imperial’ states of the world pursue what their leaders define as their interests. In the process, it was necessary to grapple with the problem of how people living in a country with a potential of satisfying all their real human needs come to behave in most self-destructive ways, caught-up in world power games which they only now begin to understand” (*ibid.*, p. 180, emphasis added).

Objectivity and engagement are articulated in terms of ‘involvement’ and ‘detachment’ and their negotiation allows the analysis to move from the calculation of ethnic separation to the moralisation of superpower politics. The point about this rather early work in Cypriot conflict studies is that the paratextual negotiation of objectivity and engagement has clearly struck a chord with the text’s audiences over the years, which included not only students and researchers working on the conflict but also the Greek-Cypriot political establishment, which its author later joined as a highly-esteemed diplomat. This is because the negotiation allowed the presentation of a political point as an academic one: that the root causes of the conflict were not so much to be found in the ‘nature’ of Cypriots, who had for many years lived together in peace, but in the import of nationalism from the motherlands, and the superpower interests in the region. The work thus becomes representative of the tendency in Cypriot studies to use scholarly work for political purposes⁷ – even where this use arises not from the text itself but from the environment in which it is received.

In this political mode of writing the predictive and prescriptive scope of the writings is prevalent, and the analysis often takes on the double task of explaining phenomena and their implications for the future, as well as of providing suggestions to policy-makers and social actors for attaining that future. This is true not only of ‘native’ works but also of those by foreigners, lending the negotiation of engagement and objectivity an ‘international politics’ dimension whereby the ‘native’ or ‘foreigner’ identity of the author is presented as key to reaching a correct balance. Yet in practice, this balance has hardly been attained, leaving instead the equation between ‘native’ and ‘partial’ unquestioned.

It is indicative of the prevalence of this politicisation of writing, that it has in fact become a distancing technique to point out one's 'foreign-ness', even in the most political of works. Consider for example David Hannay's remarks prefacing his 2005 *Cyprus: The Search for a Solution*, an analysis largely borne out of his experiences as Britain's Special Representative for Cyprus:

"Most of what has been written about Cyprus has been the work of members of one or other of the two embattled communities ... As such they are at best distorted by that prism, at worst little better than polemic and propaganda. And the non-Cypriots who have ventured into the field seem to have fallen prey to the same distortions, often appearing as little more than apologists for one side or the other." (Hannay, 2005, p. viii, emphasis added).

The paradigm set here is one where engagement is equated with distortion and that distortion comes to define what is native. What is most problematic about this discourse is that it appears to be a legitimate perspective not only in lay memoir works such as this, but in political research as well. Thus, the wider point raised for academia concerns the absence of questioning native-ness in political science.

The implications of this question can clearly be understood by comparison to the way in which this question of native analysis has been dealt with in postcolonial anthropology. Despite arguments that the debate on 'native anthropology' is on the whole rather futile and has often been misguided (Fabian, 1983; Narayan, 1993; Argyrou, 1999; Hastrup, 1993; Gupta and Ferguson, 1991), the value of the anthropological arguments aired in the debate has been the fact that they have always involved a critical view of 'identity' and its markers, especially those related to power differences, such as ethnicity. In this sense, I think that the absence of similar debates in other disciplines, and especially in political science, where analyses are produced that are often based on anecdotal evidence collected by researchers in their capacity as 'natives' is equally damaging mainly because it 'dares not' acknowledge the political conditions of production of these analyses. Whereas in anthropology it was the debate on 'native anthropology' that ended up reifying 'native' identities, it seems that it is precisely this reification that makes such a debate appear obsolete for political analysis. This is problematic especially when this analysis sets off to examine 'conflicts', by which I mean situations where different 'discourses', 'modes of being', or 'understanding of the world' are opposed to one another. Thus, what is at stake for me in examining such modes of writing from the prism of 'objectivity' and 'engagement' is the negotiation of other conflicts through the text: between weak and powerful, victim and perpetrator, coloniser and colonised, righteous and wrongful, knowledgeable and naïve: all summed up in the negotiation between the scientist and the person who is sensitive to the problems he (in the cases examined here) describes.

These insights from postcolonialism are particularly pertinent in the consideration of David Hannay's work because they help illustrate the circularity of the argument being made. By discrediting 'native' interpretations (a claim that essentialises the notion of 'native' rather dangerously) the author attempts to legitimise his own involvement in 'the search for a solution', which has been criticised by local politicians as symbolic of malevolent foreign meddling in Cypriot affairs. This ends up equating 'native' to 'nationalist' and renders outsiders' viewpoints as the first prerequisite for objectivity, something which is nevertheless presented as always under threat of being contaminated by 'native' biases. This circularity indicates, beyond its colonialist presumption (which in itself also helps reify the identity of the coloniser), the 'blind alley' that the search for objectivity represents in Cyprus conflict studies and the role that the notion of ethnic origins has played in leading it there.

Pride and Politics

At the same time both of the accounts cited above indicate that aside from its link to ethnicity, the questioning of objectivity has, to varying degrees, been problematised, yet questions about the conditions of authorship were never explicitly asked. Such questions would include the identification of the position from which one is writing and the audience that one is addressing, the relationship between the authors' social and political positioning, and their analytical conclusions, the extent to which the author's experience of events is the basis on which the validity of the account is claimed, the relationship between the analysts' 'expert' persona and the role they often perform as 'public intellectuals'. These questions are largely about exploring 'native' categories in a critical way, which would almost inevitably have led to reflexivity entering the discussion. However, in not being explicitly addressed, this inquiry was foreclosed, even before the work of reflexivity had begun.

Kızılyürek's *Ολική Κύπρος* [Cyprus as a Whole], one of the most discussed works amongst Greek-Cypriot analysts (academics and intellectuals) at least, of the Cyprus conflict, written in 1990, is indicative of such a reflexive attempt because it opens with the following disclaimer:

"This book is not a scientific monograph. Even though it contains texts, which could form the basis of scientific work, the book in its totality is a collection of thoughts born mainly on the occasion of studies, speeches, and interviews."
(Kızılyürek, 1990, p. 9).⁸

Considering that the book was published in Nicosia, in Greek, by a non-academic press, and that apart from the mentioned interviews, presentations and commentaries, it also contains excerpts from an analysis published earlier in Turkish that drew on Marxist theory to explain the development of Turkish-Cypriot

and Greek-Cypriot nationalisms (Kızılyürek, 1988), the emphasis placed in this statement (of being political and proud of it) is noticeable. Its aim, I would argue, is not simply to cast the book as ‘non-academic’ but rather to set-up a distinction between ‘scientific’ (epistemonikés) and ‘non-scientific’ analyses. It is thus an epistemological claim about this particular work that also alludes to the conditions of epistemology on the Cyprus issue (i.e. the conditions of production of knowledge about the Cyprus problem, which also implies a contemplation of how this knowledge comes to be). This claim is made explicit in the following sentences:

“I tried to write this volume using the little Greek that I have and a lot of help from my Greek-Cypriot friends. This is, I believe the most substantial message.

You will find here the opinions (apópsis) of a Turkish-Cypriot writer. At the same time – and this is the most important thing – you will find the mind-set (psycholoyía) and the vexations (provlmatismí) of a Turkish-Cypriot. Because I am still ‘idealist’ enough to believe that this is the time for the Cyprus problem to be solved within the space of Cypriot intellectual thought (tou pnévmatos ke tis sképsis ton Kiprón). Up until now, we have been talking more about the technical formulae of the solution and less about people themselves and their input.” (Kızılyürek, 1990, p. 9, emphasis added).

In making explicit the publication’s political aims, this passage clarifies, I think, the author’s perception of the distinction between ‘scientific’ and ‘political’ writing encountered in the previous quote (note though the absence of the word ‘political’ there). And it is exactly the need to make this distinction explicit that reveals the blurred background against which the book was written. The insistence on speaking as a Turkish-Cypriot to a specifically Greek-Cypriot audience is also meant to highlight the goals of this intervention, while at the same time providing an explanation for the perpetuation of this blurring of boundaries – the ‘analytical’ and the ‘political’ can only be equated in a Cypriot epistemology that is communally enclosed, and from which inter-communal communication is excluded. By initiating such communication, the understanding of ‘epistemology’ is opened up, yet in order to initiate this process, a self-defined ‘non-scientific’ but ‘political’ mode of writing must be adopted.

What the introduction does, in effect, is to announce the entry of intellectual contemplation into the public domain. The phrase “within the space of Cypriot intellectual thought” could also at first glance have been translated as “according to the spirit and the thoughts of Cypriots”. But, belying the author’s introductory linguistic disclaimer, the phrasing in Greek links the intellectual and public domains; and does so against that of official politics and high-level negotiations. Yet in announcing this entry ‘science’ is denounced in favour of politics – the boundary is pointed out and adopted through an argument that seems to be asking for its reconfiguration.

The paradox set up in this argument has had wide repercussions on both Cypriot academia and politics. Five years after its publication, it spurred a debate widely-publicised in the Greek-Cypriot media, when the then Minister of Education, argued for the withdrawal of the book from the library of the University of Cyprus, on the basis that it insulted (Greek-Cypriot) 'national interests'. This caused University authorities, as well as a number of Greek-Cypriot intellectuals to take part in the debate, widening it over a range of issues, including the University's autonomy from the government, the limits of freedom of speech, the meanings of 'propaganda' and 'censorship', and the politics of bi-communalism (i.e. the promotion of communication between Greek- and Turkish-Cypriot citizens, at that point still separated by a highly militarised and virtually closed partition line). What seems to have been taken for granted in this debate was the fact that the identity of the author as a Turkish-Cypriot was an integral part of the arguments advanced. Yet the political arguments made in this publication at the time represented the views of an individual, who, within the Turkish-Cypriot community espoused the political views of a relatively small opposition against official Turkish-Cypriot political positions. Furthermore, the author's positions, which promoted greater understanding and concerted political action between the two communities, and which rejected the nationalism cultivated over the previous decades in the two sides, were also espoused by a number of Greek-Cypriot activists and intellectuals, some of whom took an active part in the debate. Thus, paradoxically, of the two introductory remarks the author had made, the separation between 'science' and 'politics' disappeared in the debate, while the equation between 'ethnic' identity and the conflated understanding of political/scientific analysis was reinforced.

Indeed, it is striking that whatever attempts at reflexivity have been undertaken in analyses of the conflict thus far, appear to take as their central point of reference the author's 'ethnic' identity, as if it is this that above all determines their writing and on the basis upon which the analysis should be read and judged. I see this insistence as a social phenomenon in itself, directly linked to the legacy of the conflict and specifically the ways in which 'Turkish-' and 'Greek-' Cypriot identities have solidified over the years.⁹ Based on this, I would argue that if print capitalism and nationalism developed in parallel and fed off each other as Anderson postulated (Anderson, 1991), the possibilities of articulating perspectives outside this structure of connection need to be re-thought. The specific book is important in this sense because it uses language (Greek) to address an audience limited by ethnicity and class (Greek-Cypriot intellectuals and analysts) and asks them to imagine their 'other' community by essentialising the ethnicity of its author (i.e. taking his Turkish-Cypriotness as the essence of his identity).

Unacknowledged Legislation

Another way in which the link between ethnic connection and objectivity was made was by supplanting the lack of native-ness with the ability to empathise. In this

sense, one of the most explicit claims to objectivity in analysing the Cyprus problem was made against the claim of ‘detachment’, yet by an ‘outsider’. Hitchens’s *Hostage to History* (originally published as *Cyprus*) is to date one of the most popular accounts of the conflict, having gone through two new editions under an updated title (Hitchens, 1984, 1989, 1997). Much in the manner of Attalides, Hitchens opens his book by criticising in his preface Nancy Crawshaw’s academic analysis (as opposed to the journalistic account of *The Economist*) of Greek-Cypriot aspirations for enosis as the primary cause for the division of the island (Crawshaw, 1978). He argues that “these consoling explanations make it easier for those responsible to excuse themselves and for the rest of the world to forget about Cyprus” (Hitchens, 1984, p. 10). And he continues to offer his own claim to objectivity:

“Even from this perspective [having seen the ‘desecration of the island’s beauty], I have still had the privilege of coming to know and to love another people. I believe that I can be objective about the politics of Cyprus, but I most certainly cannot be indifferent or dispassionate. I have tried to preserve this distinction in the following pages, where I argue that the Cypriots are not, as many believe, the chief authors of their own misfortunes. I believe that I may tell a truer story if I admit at once to a sense of outrage which Durrell and his emulators have been spared” (*ibid.*, p. 28, emphasis added).

The reference to Durrell is to be read, it seems to me, as a criticism of the ethnocentrism that pervades *Bitter Lemons*, a literary work that centres on Durrell’s ‘detached’ experience of Cypriot politics (Durrell, 1957). Yet I would argue that Hitchens was actually not as impartial as he strove to be – he wrote the book as a direct protest against the invasion of the island, and while conceding early on that “I have no difficulty in sympathizing with Turkish Cypriot fears, and I do not believe that they were manufactured out of thin air” (Hitchens, 1984, p. 40), he does not feel the need to qualify his sympathy with Greek-Cypriot pain – as if the latter was self-evident to a greater extent, as if the key to understanding the conflict is really understanding the legitimacy of Greek-Cypriot nationalism, after it has been purged of the monstrosity of Sampson. In the paragraph that precedes the conclusion to the book he says:

“... Cyprus remains as the symbol of unresolved Greek and Turkish conflict. It symbolizes, for the Greeks, what Andreas Papandreou has called ‘the shrinkage of Hellenism’ – the pushing of Greeks and Greek life out of Asia Minor and Constantinople that took place in living memory.” (*ibid.*, p. 156).

We are never told what it symbolises for the Turks.

In this sense, I would argue that this study marks a point in Cypriot conflict studies when the potential for popularity began spiralling towards a decreasing stylistic difference between ‘analysis’ and ‘propaganda’. Policy-focused research

thus also turned to explaining (in addition to suggesting) policy positions – and as Greek-Cypriot policy came to rely increasingly on legal norms, so did analysis adopt an increasingly legalistic language. In this sense, it could be said that what began with Hitchens’ effort at entering the public sphere as an intellectual – what he elsewhere called an ‘unacknowledged legislator’ (Hitchens, 2000) – turned into the intellectualisation of state rhetoric through the language of law in order to facilitate its take-over of the public sphere.

One of the best examples of such work is Chrysostomides’ impressive Study in International Law, representing a hybrid kind of literature: in form a well-researched academic study, but of yet unmistakably propagandistic content. By 2003, when their author became Government Spokesman, his arguments could easily be read as an explanation of the Republic’s government policy. In it, he argues against the Turkish ‘invasion’ of 1974 and the legitimacy of the ‘TRNC’. He also explains the legality of the Republic’s EU membership application (still a matter of political debate at that point) and the international legal validity of almost all major Greek-Cypriot policies pursued thus far.

As with Attalides’ work, explicit negotiation of objectivity and engagement here is almost absent, and when present relegated entirely to paratexts. In the preface, for example, the author argues:

“in a primitive society a political problem can be solved (by) ... the force of arms ... In developed societies of the 21st century, as in mathematics, if a proper solution to a problem is desired, it can only be achieved if based on some elementary axioms or principles” (Chrysostomides, 2000, p. x, emphasis added).

The value-laden qualification ‘developed’ is juxtaposed to ‘mathematics’, which here stands for ‘scientific purity’, making the argument that will be developed appear ‘purely’ logical. Thus, he then explains that these axioms and principles entail:

- (i) the establishment of the true facts and
- (ii) the ascertainment of the rules by which a problem is to be solved

before concluding this logical progression of thought:

“It seems, therefore, that by a simple process of elementary logic, if a lasting and proper solution is to be achieved to a problem, principles or axioms cannot be pushed aside, they must constitute its underlying basis.” (ibid.).

This conclusion is proven to be watertight by applying and dismissing, in true scientific fashion, the counterargument, namely that realpolitik sometimes clashes

with principles and axioms through the statement that it is “difficult to comprehend why it [realpolitik] must prevail over rules, principles, and axioms” (ibid., p. xi). Pushing this argument to the margin of the preface makes reference to counterarguments throughout the volume almost obsolete, since the reader should be convinced of the author’s scientific rigour through this logical presentation of method. Despite this, counterarguments are presented at various points, where reference is made to ‘the Turkish viewpoint’ mostly represented by Necatigil. An example is the mention of the “position taken by the Turkish side” where the author claims that “it is very indicative that Turkish Cypriot writer Z. Negatigil [sic] attempts to base this argument (i.e. that the state of the Republic of Cyprus collapsed in 1963) solely on Turkish sources, or writers known for their obvious bias towards Turkish allegations” (ibid., p. 97). These arguments are then dismissed as “legal improvisations”. This example shows an awareness of how paratextual material, in this case references, can indicate bias. And this further explains the emphasis placed throughout the book on referencing and engaging in depth with international standards of law, international case law, and international legal process – even though Necatigil is one of only two Turkish names in the reference list.

The rightfulness of the Greek-Cypriot position is proven on this basis, specifically concerning the issues that have over the years spearheaded governmental arguments against the other side in the international arena:

- (i) the uninterrupted continuation of the state of the Republic since 1960
- (ii) the illegality of the invasion and occupation of the north by Turkish troops
- (iii) the continuation of the violation of a number of personal rights by Turkey, including the right to property, and freedom from ill-treatment
- (iv) the violation of the Geneva Convention by Turkey with respect to the settling of populations in the north
- (v) the Greek-Cypriot stance in high-level negotiations since 1974, and
- (vi) the application of the Republic for accession to the EU.

Having proven this rightfulness, the book concludes with a re-statement of the point made in the preface, only now in starker terms:

“Let nobody hide behind the neutral allusion: ‘but, there are always two sides and two versions to a dispute’; Nazi Germany also had its own version of events and arguments during the Second World War, only one though, the other [sic] version, was right.” (ibid., p. 494).

Finally, the objectivity of the author’s position is repeated in the postscript, in which the decision of the European Court of Human Rights in the case of Cyprus against Turkey, which was reached between completion of writing and publication, proves according to the author:

“that a continuing policy of ethnic cleansing is pursued by the occupant power. The ECtHR will, most probably, soon have the last word on this fourth Cyprus State Application against Turkey” (ibid., p. 506).

The point made here is that the European Court could in fact have easily agreed with the author not only on the points mentioned in their decision – which indeed found Turkey to be in violation of a number of fundamental human rights (ECtHR, 2002) – but on each and every point made in the book.

In presenting objectivity in these terms, the question of engagement comes full circle – it becomes obsolete, and is thus silenced. Legislation is drafted in to perform the work of truth, but the politics behind the legal positions adopted remain unacknowledged.

Signing Off: The Personal and the Political

One place where the negotiation between engagement and objectivity may most lucidly and succinctly be compared is the dedication page. In each of the works it speaks to the author’s politics of this negotiation and in this sense, a brief comparison will help summarise the points I have been trying to make.

Of the five, two in fact have no dedication-proper. Attalides’ work lacks a dedication page altogether. The absence, I would argue, can be read as an indication of a lack of attachment to a particular person whose perspective might be seen to have guided the work.¹⁰ This is in line with the author’s key message throughout the book, that things are far more complicated than any single interpretation might suggest. It is this lack of attachment that anchors objectivity; in the negotiation between the two, ‘detachment’ is seen to weigh more heavily than ‘involvement’, at least in theory (op. cit.).

Kızılyürek has similarly no dedication, but has reserved instead the page for a quote that despite being unattributed, comes from Victor Hugo. It reads in Greek “nothing is stronger than an idea whose time has come”. In this case, the quote seems to underscore the urge prevalent throughout for developing new political intellectual thought. A political-literary dedication thus appears much more appropriate than a personal one. But in fact this renders the refusal to adopt an ‘objective’ viewpoint more legitimate because it is being sanctified by a great author.

In Chrysostomides’ work, on the other hand, the dedication page is highly political and speaks most loudly of the author’s negotiation of objectivity and engagement. Written in ancient-style Greek, which harks back to the notion of Cyprus’ Greek cultural heritage, it signals that the book was written “*Patrí mnímis hárin*”, “for the sake of remembering the fatherland”. The dedication of the book to the fatherland underlies the point made throughout the book, of the rightfulness of

Greek-Cypriot positions. The dedication signals the basis of this conviction, i.e. that the author belongs to this specific fatherland, but at the same time pushes it to the margin, making it appear irrelevant for the scientific analysis that follows. Yet the trace that remains in the dedication “to the fatherland”, I would argue, is a trace of reflexivity in spite of everything: a trace of the author’s awareness that this could be read as a nationalist text – a possibility counteracted by the insistence on the righteousness of patriotism and victimhood (of the fatherland in danger of being forgotten).

Interestingly, the two ‘proper’ dedications in the works examined belong to the two foreign authors. And it would seem that this foreign identity calls for engagement and objectivity to be negotiated primarily in terms of their insider/outsider status.

In Hitchens’ account, the dedication page explains that “this book is for Eleni and for Laurence Stern (1929-79)” (1984, p. xi). This brings together the author’s personas as engaged insider (married, at that time, to a Greek-Cypriot) and objective outsider (mentored by a respected authority on the issue, who pioneered the specific line of argumentation).

And finally, in Hannay’s study, where passionate involvement of any kind is derided, the comparatively lengthy dedication describes a dispassionate involvement that has even so, proved too much: “To my wife, my children and my grandchildren who uncomplainingly put up with my absences even after I was meant to have retired.” (op. cit., p. vi). This Cyprus is an imposed professional commitment, making the author’s own commitment so professional as to be juxtaposed to the personal.

What Cyprus means to each author is vastly different, yet a first hint already given in these tribute pages.

Conclusion

The works I have looked at here are not the only examples of how objectivity and engagement are negotiated, nor are they the only ones where this is done paratextually. As indication, suffice it to mention counterpart works concentrating on the north, or addressing a Turkish-Cypriot audience: Necatigil, as Chrysostomides insightfully points out (a further trace of his awareness of his own engagement, one might claim) has used legal arguments to promote state rhetoric in the north in a similar fashion (Necatigil, 1993); Harry Scott Gibbon’s *Genocide Files* (Gibbons, 1997), although much more clearly biased than Hitchens, was written as a foreign correspondent’s account of the conflict and treads the line

between empathy and exactness; Tony Angastiniotis, who, like Kızılyürek before him, is known primarily as a Cypriot who chose to live in the other side, aims to speak as a Greek-Cypriot to a Turkish-Cypriot audience (even if in addition to a Greek-Cypriot one) (Angastiniotis, 2005; Angastiniotis, 2004); and Vamik Volkan's groundbreaking psychological study is centred on the years of Turkish-Cypriot oppression (Volkan, 1979) and has placed its author since then in an ideal position to advocate political positions abroad using a scientific argumentation basis (Volkan, 2008). Equally, one may argue that this collection merely proposes a mirror image for a Turkish-Cypriot audience where no perfect 'opposition' exists. Instead, Attalides' book could be argued to have shaped Turkish-Cypriot academic discourse to a great extent, as did Kızılyürek's works in English and Turkish – which in turn goes to show that the books examined are not the only works of the cited authors showing this negotiation. One might also look at even earlier studies to uncover different connections (Stephens, 1966; Kyriakides, 1968; Salihi, 1968; Markides, 1977). But, in as far as these works are in different ways the hallmarks of the authors' works on Cyprus, they are also the hallmarks of academic engagement with politics and vice-versa.

By looking at these texts I firstly tried to show that political modes of writing need not be confined to obvious types of propaganda – indeed my main argument has been that these politics are often pushed to the margin. At the same time, however, I have tried to argue that this pushing to the margin is indicative of a conscious negotiation on the part of the author between concepts of 'engagement', required for political positioning, and 'objectivity', required for scientific analysis. The literature on the Cyprus conflict has largely been a situated literature, perhaps precisely because its political point of focus has often required the explication of the analysts' political ideology. The boundary between political writing and analytical writing has thus proven very difficult to maintain. So much so that the most successful attempts to uphold it have entailed the abandonment of the claim of objectivity and at points to scientific analysis as well.

Thus, one final point to mention that comes out of the comparison of the paratexts in these works is that the one that appears to be most effective in terms of methodological and conceptual innovation is the one which is most obviously partial – the one that claims a specific standpoint and a specific politics, by sidelining claims to 'objectivity'. It can always be claimed of course, that to take so explicitly a stance against one's own objectivity is to veil the suggestion that one is so objective as to be able to address their own partiality – which is partly the point Hitchens makes also. But I think what both claims are indicative of in the context of Cypriot conflict studies, is that despite the definitions of both 'objectivity' and 'engagement' in academic and/or scientific terms, both remain tightly bound to ethnic understandings of identity. It is in this sense that an intervention that

questions this understanding of insiders and outsiders, in the manner that the anthropological investigation of 'what is native' has done, becomes relevant.

* This article developed out of research undertaken in the context of a 'literature review' for a collaborative project, funded by DG Research at the EU Commission (FP 5), on the impact of the EU on border conflicts in the wider European region. However, some of the ideas presented were also formed during the course of ethnographic field research carried out in Cyprus between August 2002 and October 2003, which was sponsored by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research (Grant # 6919). For comments on drafts of the original literature review I would like to thank Michelle Pace, Thomas Diez, and Myria Vassiliadou. For introducing me to Genette's work, I would like to thank Tania Demetriou, and for comments on the article I thank Themis Demetriou, the journal's editors and three anonymous referees. I also thank Mehmet Yashin for sharing his views on some of the central ideas with me.

Notes

1. An exemplary theme is intertextuality (Allen, 2000), where the techniques of exploring the relation of one text to another have been applied to psychoanalysis (Kristeva, 1980), postcolonialism (Bhabha, 1994), and anthropology (Clifford and Marcus, 1986; Hanks, 2000).
2. Recent debates about the meaning and objectives of literature reviews, the prime example of the treatment of scientific text as text, are indicative of this importance (Boote and Beile, 2005; Maxwell, 2006).
3. This is presented in Demetriou, 2004.
4. Where I use the words 'objectivity' and 'engagement' in quotes, it is to indicate that I refer to the (author's) perception of these concepts rather than to them as free-standing qualities.
5. An exception to this might arguably be Kızılyürek's text, because it is written in Greek, which as one reviewer correctly pointed out raises additional questions. However, the ways in which it compares with the different texts on other grounds mentioned was felt to merit inclusion in the sample.
6. See Hitchens, 2002; O'Malley and Craig, 1999; Yennaris, 2004; and [<http://www.lobbyforcyprus.org/press/press2001/Gu260201.htm>]. The basis of this claim is the fact that Kissinger had been informed of Turkish plans to attack following the Greek-inspired coup against Makarios and did not thwart them. This thesis, one of Attalides' reviewers explains, was first expounded by Lawrence Stern in 1975, and then by Hitchens in an article preceding the Cyprus book (Parker, 1980), a fact that beautifully illustrates the processes through which a specific discourse developed.

7. Bryant makes a parallel point about Greek-Cypriot education during the colonial period when she says that the main point was to teach truths already known (Bryant, 2004, pp. 129-155). Significantly, she also explains that the purpose was to create ethnic subjects.
8. This quote, as well as subsequent ones, is my translation.
9. Indeed, the very fact that some readers might find the argument facile proves the point, I think, that it has come to be expected that an author's ethnic identity would be of paramount significance to the work produced and the ways in which it is read.
10. The same seems to hold for the acknowledgements, where the four people acknowledged as having read the manuscript (Costas Carras, Niels Kadritzke, Peter Loizos and Tassos Papadopoulos) come from different national backgrounds and political ideologies, and are not responsible, it is emphasised in one of the few witticisms in the book, "for any errors of omission or commission" (op. cit., p. vi).

Bibliography

- Allen, G. (2000) *Intertextuality*. London, Routledge.
- Anastasiou, H. (2002) 'Communication across Conflict Lines: The Case of Ethnically Divided Cyprus', *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 39, No. 5, pp. 581-596.
- Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined Communities*. London, Verso.
- Angastiniotis, T. (2004) *Voice of Blood*. Documentary, Cyprus.
- — —. (2005) *Trapped in the Green Line: "The Story Behind the Documentary Voice of Blood"*. Nicosia, Rustem Bookshop and Publishing Ltd.
- Argyrou, V. (1999) 'Sameness and the Ethnological Will to Meaning', *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 40, pp. 29-41.
- Attalides, M. (1979) *Cyprus, Nationalism and International Politics*. London, Macmillan Press.
- — —. (2003) *Cyprus: Nationalism and International Politics*. Mannheim and Möhnesee, Bibliopolis.
- Barthes, R. (1999 [1953]) *Writing Degree Zero*. New York, Hill and Wang.
- Bhabha, H. (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London, Routledge.
- Boote, B.N. and Beile, P. (2005) 'Scholars before Researchers: On the Centrality of the Dissertation Literature Review in Research Preparation', *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 34, No. 6, pp. 3-15.
- Bowman, J. (2006) 'Seeing What's Missing in Memories of Cyprus', *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 119-127.
- Bryant, R. (2001) 'Justice or Respect? A Comparative Perspective on Politics in Cyprus', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 6, pp. 892-924.
- — —. (2004) *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*. London, IB Tauris.
- Chrysostomides, K. (2000) *The Republic of Cyprus: A Study in International Law*. Hague, M. Nijhoff.

- Clifford, J. and Marcus, G.E.(eds). (1986) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Constantinou, C. and Papadakis, Y. (2001) 'The Cypriot State(s) in Situ: Cross-Ethnic Contact and the Discourse of Recognition', *Global Society*, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 125-148.
- Crawshaw, N. (1978) *The Cyprus Revolt: An Account of the Struggle for Union with Greece*. London/Boston, G. Allen and Unwin.
- Demetriou, O. (2004) *The EU and the Cyprus Conflict: A Review of the Literature*. EUBORDERCONF Working Papers Series. Birmingham, University of Birmingham.
- — —. (2005) *The EU and the Cyprus Conflict: Discourses on the 'Border', the 'Conflict' and the 'EU'*. EUBORDERCONF Working Paper Series. Birmingham, University of Birmingham.
- Diez, T. (ed). (2002) *The European Union and the Cyprus Conflict: Modern Conflict, Postmodern Union*. Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- Durrell, L. (1957) *Bitter Lemons*. London, Faber and Faber.
- ECtHR, European Court of Human Rights (2002) *Case of Cyprus V. Turkey, Merits, Judgment of 10 May 2001, Appl. No. 25781/94: ECHR Reports of Judgments and Decisions*.
- Fabian, J. (1983) *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York, Columbia University Press.
- Genette, G. (1991) 'Introduction to the Paratext', *New Literary History*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp. 261-272.
- — —. (1997 [1987]) *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbons, H.S. (1997) *The Genocide Files*. London, Charles Bravos.
- Gupta, A. and Ferguson, J. (1991) 'Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference', *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 6-23.
- Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis, M. and Trigeorgis, L. (1993) 'Cyprus: An Evolutionary Approach to Conflict Resolution', *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 340-360.
- Hanks, W.F. (2000) *Intertexts: Writings on Language, Utterance, and Context*. Oxford, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Hannay, D. (2005) *Cyprus: The Search for a Solution*. London, IB Tauris.
- Hastrup, K. (1993) 'Native Anthropology: A Contradiction in Terms?', *Folk*, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp. 147-161.
- Hitchens, C. (1984) *Cyprus*. London, Quartet Books.
- — —. (1989) *Hostage to History: Cyprus from the Ottomans to Kissinger*. New York, Noonday Press.
- — —. (1997) *Hostage to History: Cyprus from the Ottoman to Kissinger*. London, Verso.
- — —. (2000) *Unacknowledged Legislation: Writers in the Public Sphere*. London, Verso.
- — —. (2002) *The Trial of Henry Kissinger*. London, Verso.
- Karageorghis, V. (1982) *Cyprus from the Stone Age to the Romans*. London, Thames and Hudson.

- Kızılyürek, N. (1988) *Paşalar Papazlar* [Pashas, Priests]: Istanbul Graphics.
- — —. (1990) *Ολική Κύπρος*. Nicosia, Kasoulides Printing House.
- — —. (2002) *Milliyetçilik Kışkancında Kıbrıs* [Cyprus in the Claws of Nationalism]. İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.
- Kristeva, J. (1980) *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York, Columbia University Press.
- Kyriakides, S. (1968) *Cyprus: Constitutionalism and Crisis Government*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Markides, K.C. (1977) *The Rise and Fall of the Cyprus Republic*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Maxwell, J.A. (2006) 'Literature Reviews of, and for, Educational Research: A Commentary on Boote and Beile's "Scholars before Researchers"', *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 35, No. 9, pp. 28-31.
- Narayan, K. (1993) 'How Native is a "Native" Anthropologist?', *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 95, No. 3, pp. 671-686.
- Necatigil, Z.M. (1993) *The Cyprus Question and the Turkish Position in International Law*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- O'Malley, B. and Craig, I. (1999) *The Cyprus Conspiracy: America, Espionage, and the Turkish Invasion*. London, IB Tauris.
- Ortaylı, I. (2007) On the History of Cyprus. Keynote speech at the 6th International Congress on Cyprus Studies, Eastern Mediterranean University. Famagusta, 24 October.
- Papadakis, Y. (2005) *Echoes from the Dead Zone: Across the Cyprus Divide*. London, IB Tauris.
- Parker, J.S.F. (1980) Review of 'Cyprus: Nationalism and International Politics', *International Affairs*, Vol. 56, No. 3, pp. 528-529.
- Ramm, C. (2006) 'Assessing Transnational Re-Negotiation in the Post-1974 Turkish Cypriot Community: "Cyprus Donkeys", "Black Beards" and the "EU Carrot"', *South East European and Black Sea Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 523-542.
- Salih, H.I. (1968) *Cyprus: An Analysis of Cypriot Political Discord*. New York, T. Gaus and Sons.
- Stephens, R.H. (1966) *Cyprus: A Place of Arms*. London, Pall Mall Press.
- Volkan, V.D. (1979) *Cyprus - War and Adaptation: A Psychoanalytic History of Two Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia.
- — —. (2008) An Addition to the Turkish Translation of Dr Volkan's *Cyprus: War and Adaptation*, 2008. Paper available at [<http://www.austenriggs.org/uploads/basicContentWidget/1994/KIBRISenglishvdd.pdf>], accessed 12 May 2008.
- Yennaris, C. (2004) *From the East: Conflict and Partition in Cyprus*. London, Elliot and Thompson.

THE LEGAL STATUS OF THE BUFFER ZONE IN CYPRUS

Theodora Christodoulidou

Abstract

The legal status of the buffer zone in Cyprus, its regulation and operation is ambiguous. The present article argues that it is not clear what the legal basis of the buffer zone is: is it an agreement between the two respective armies/states in the conflict? (i.e. Cypriot National Guard and Turkish army or Republic of Cyprus and Turkey); is it an implied agreement/acquiescence in case a formal one is not found? Has it been established by the United Nations (UN) Security Council (SC) resolution under Chapter VI of the UN Charter? This ambiguity regarding the basis of the zone raises further questions: who regulates its operation? What activities are permitted in the buffer zone? Are civilian activities permitted in the buffer zone? This paper attempts to tackle some of the most complex questions on the buffer zone in Cyprus.

Keywords: buffer zone, “green line”, UNFICYP, Cyprus peacekeeping operation, SC mandate

The Establishment of the Buffer Zone: A Background

The Republic of Cyprus became an independent state on 16 August 1960. Its establishment and constitution had its roots in agreements reached between the heads of Government of Greece and Turkey at Zurich in 1959, which were subsequently incorporated in agreements reached between those Governments and the United Kingdom (UK). The representatives of the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities accepted the documents concerned. The agreements were embodied in treaties – the Treaty of Establishment and the Treaty of Guarantee signed by Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and the UK and the Treaty of Alliance, signed by Cyprus, Greece and Turkey – and in the Constitution, signed in Nicosia on 16 August 1960.¹

In 1963 in the face of the outbreak of inter-communal violence between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, the Governments of the UK, Greece and Turkey offered a joint peacekeeping force. This offer was accepted by the Cyprus Government, a cease-fire was reached and a joint force was established. A neutral

zone along the cease fire line (“green line”) between the areas occupied by the two communities in Nicosia was created. That zone was to be patrolled by the joint peacemaking force.²

In view of the inter-communal violence, on 4 March 1964 UNFICYP was established by SC resolution 186 with the consent of the Government of Cyprus.³ According to resolution 186 UNFICYP’s mandate was defined in the following terms: “in the interest of preserving international peace and security, to use its best efforts to prevent a recurrence of fighting and, as necessary, to contribute to the maintenance and restoration of law and order and a return to normal conditions”.⁴ In pursuance of the SC resolution, the government of Cyprus signed an agreement with UNFICYP delineating the legal status governing UNFICYP.⁵

On 20 July 1974 the Turkish Government, invoking the Treaty of Guarantee of 1960, launched an extensive military operation on the north coast of Cyprus which resulted eventually in the occupation of the northern part of the island. The SC adopted resolution 353 by which it called upon all parties to cease firing and demanded the immediate end of foreign military intervention.⁶ Resolution 353 also called on all parties to cooperate fully with UNFICYP to enable it to carry out its mandate – thus, indicating that UNFICYP was expected to continue to function despite the radically changed circumstances.

As called for in SC resolution 353 the foreign ministers of Greece, Turkey and the UK began discussions in Geneva in July 1974 whereby they agreed on the text of a declaration known as the Geneva Declaration. By the Geneva Declaration the foreign ministers agreed on certain measures that involved action by UNFICYP. Among others, the “Geneva Declaration” provided that “a security zone of size to be determined by representatives of Greece, Turkey and the UK in consultation with UNFICYP should be established at the limit of the areas occupied by the Turkish armed forces. This zone should be entered by no forces other than those of UNFICYP, which should supervise the prohibition of entry. Pending the determination of the size and character of the security zone, the existing area between the two forces should be entered by no forces”.⁷

On 14 August 1974 the negotiations of the three Foreign Ministers which had been resumed at Geneva ended without agreement.⁸ On the morning of that day a second Turkish military operation started, resulting in the occupation of most of the northern part of Cyprus. The cease fire came into effect on 16 August 1974.

Immediately afterwards, UNFICYP inspected areas of confrontation and recorded the deployment of the military forces on both sides. Lines drawn between the forward defended localities became respectively the National Guard and

Turkish forces cease-fire lines. In the absence of a formal cease-fire agreement, the military status quo as recorded by UNFICYP at the time, became the standard by which it was judged whether any changes constituted violations of the cease-fire. The military status quo was subsequently clarified and further adjusted in numerous local agreements between the units of UNFICYP and of the sides concerned.⁹

Absence of Agreements Vis-à-vis the Establishment of the Buffer Zone

In view of the above description of facts and the failure of the foreign ministers of Greece, Turkey and the UK in Geneva to reach a conclusion regarding the establishment of a security zone, the question is what is the legal basis of the existing buffer zone in Cyprus?

The legal basis of the buffer zone, its establishment, regulation and operation is ambiguous. This is so because no formal agreement has ever been concluded between the two respective armies in the conflict (i.e. Cypriot National Guard and Turkish army) nor has there been any overall agreement between the parties in the conflict and the United Nations jointly or separately on the establishment, delineation and regulation of the buffer zone. The Secretary-General in his 1993 report acknowledges the lack of an agreement when he writes that: "there is still no formal agreement between United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus and the two sides on the complete delineation of the buffer zone as recorded by UNFICYP, nor the use and control of the buffer zone".¹⁰

Nonetheless, the establishment and delineation of the buffer zone, as fluid as the concept may be, seems to enjoy the implied consent or acquiescence of the two respective armies. Indeed, the demarcation lines show the line at which the advancement of the Turkish invading forces halted. South of the same zone, the demarcation line defines the defence line at which the Cypriot National Guard managed to hold positions in 1974. Therefore, it seems that both armies and their respective governments acquiesced to the de facto establishment of the buffer zone.¹¹ This is also substantiated by the fact that since the establishment of the buffer zone, neither the Cypriot Government nor Turkey have openly challenged its establishment. The Secretary-General also supports this argument when he writes that "UNFICYP finds itself supervising, by loose mutual consent, two constantly disputed cease-fire lines".¹²

Interpreting UNFICYP's Mandate Vis-à-vis the Buffer Zone

The buffer zone in Cyprus is supervised in practice by UNFICYP. The question is what is the mandate of UNFICYP vis-à-vis the buffer zone?

In 1974, UNFICYP was faced with a situation that had not been foreseen in its initial mandate. The initial mandate of UNFICYP as laid down in resolution 186 was conceived in relation to the inter-communal conflict in Cyprus, not to large scale hostilities arising from action by the armed forces of one of the guarantor powers. After the Turkish invasion of 1974 and the de facto ceasefire, the SC in resolution 364 applied the existing mandate of UNFICYP in changed circumstances involving a greater role for UNFICYP. Resolution 364 noted: "in existing circumstances the presence of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus is still needed to perform the tasks it is currently undertaking if the cease-fire is to be maintained in the island and the search for a peaceful settlement facilitated".¹³ The Secretary-General in various reports since 1974 also noted that the existing mandate of UNFICYP was applied in changed circumstances involving a greater role for UNFICYP: The Secretary-General noted: "following the events that occurred on 15 July 1974 and thereafter, the Council adopted a number of resolutions, some of which have affected the functioning of UNFICYP and in some cases have required the Force to perform certain additional or modified functions relating, in particular, to the maintenance of the cease-fire".¹⁴

The post-1974 mandate of UNFICYP as laid down by resolution 364 seems to include the maintenance of the cease fire and the search for a peaceful solution in the island. Even a cursory reading of the Secretary-General's reports shows that the functions of UNFICYP in pursuance of its mandate as laid down by SC resolution 364 are twofold: (a) the maintenance of the military status quo and prevention of a recurrence of fighting; and (b) humanitarian and economic activities to promote a return to normal conditions.¹⁵

However, despite this post-1974 mandate and the fact that the buffer zone is supervised in practice by UNFICYP, none of the above-mentioned SC resolutions providing UNFICYP's mandate, explicitly mention, authorise or establish the buffer zone. Nor do they define UNFICYP's mandate vis-à-vis the buffer zone. The lack of reference to the buffer zone in the resolutions prescribing the mandate of UNFICYP does not denote that UNFICYP has nothing to do with the buffer zone. On the contrary, the post-1974 UNFICYP mandate, which includes the maintenance of the military status quo and the cease fire, and the prevention of fighting, seems to imply that the buffer zone is a measure by which UNFICYP maintains the ceasefire and the military status quo between the two respective armies. Therefore, it is argued that the legal basis of the buffer zone seems to be SC resolution 364 providing a greater role for UNFICYP.

When a final settlement is reached, obviously, the buffer zone would naturally be discontinued, as measures to maintain the cease fire and the military status quo would be redundant. It seems that pending a final settlement, the buffer zone should

be maintained. The question arises whether reaching a final solution necessitates the continuation of the buffer zone as no man's land without an expiry date. Indeed, what activities are prohibited inside the buffer zone? Are there any activities which are not prohibited? What should be the criterion by which UNFICYP decides that certain activities are prohibited while others are not? And if the buffer zone is no man's land, the question is whether such exercise of authority by UNFICYP is legitimately posed and within its SC imposed mandate.

It seems that the measure by which UNFICYP decides which activities are prohibited is found in SC resolution prescribing UNFICYP's mandate, namely resolution 364 mentioned above. Thus, activities that endanger the cease-fire and the military status quo are prohibited in the buffer zone. UNFICYP (as part of its SC imposed mandate) must ensure that such activities do not take place. Which activities endanger the cease-fire and the military status quo and the question of whether civilian activities may be considered as activities that endanger the cease-fire and the military status quo is the issue of the next section when the mandate of UNFICYP is attempted to be interpreted.

The questions posed above are rather complicated considering the lack of a definite framework in the context of an agreement on the establishment and regulation of the buffer zone. The rules regulating the buffer zone and UNFICYP have been left to develop in practice based primarily on the said SC resolutions laying down UNFICYP's mandate, and secondarily on the annual reports of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Force in Cyprus laying down the way in which UNFICYP operates. For the purposes of interpreting UNFICYP's mandate and how it was developed in practice, the period examined is divided in two: the period prescribing the initial concept of the buffer zone, and the period where the SC and the Secretary-General introduce new terminology when referring to the buffer zone.

Initial Concept: 1974-1990

It seems that military activities or any other activities carried out by the two respective armies are prohibited in the buffer zone. This is so because such activities endanger or threaten the maintenance of the cease-fire, as authorised by SC resolution 364. This has been recognised by the Secretary-General in the initial concept of the buffer zone in 1976: "It is an essential element of the cease-fire that neither side can exercise authority or jurisdiction beyond its own forward military lines or make any military moves beyond those lines".¹⁶

The Secretariat Review Team provided a list of the main categories of cease-fire violations:

“The functions of UNFICYP are based on the requirement of the cease-fire called for by the Security Council in 1974. In keeping with these requirements, it is the position of the United Nations that the National Guard and the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot forces are required to remain behind their respective cease-fire lines and that neither can exercise authority or jurisdiction beyond its line. The following are considered by UNFICYP to be the main categories of ceasefire violations: (a) any move of military elements forward of their ceasefire line into the buffer zone; (b) the discharge of any type of weapons or explosives, without prior notification, along the cease-fire lines or up to a distance of 1 000 metres behind them; (c) building of new or strengthening of existing military positions more than 400 m of the opposing ceasefire line; (d) building of new or strengthening of existing military positions more than 400 m from the opposing cease-fire line if UNFIYCP considers this incompatible with the spirit of the ceasefire; (e) over flights of the buffer zone by military or civilian aircraft of either side; (f) troop deployment and training exercises in an area closer than 1 000 m from their cease-fire line without prior notification; (g) provocative acts between the two sides, such as shouting abuse, indecent gestures or throwing stones”.¹⁷

While military activities are prohibited inside the buffer zone, the question of the permitted activities becomes more complicated when it comes to civilian activities. This issue is being tackled by the Secretary-General in its 1976 report quoted above: “It follows that, in the area between the lines, the status quo (including innocent civilian activities [...]) is maintained, [emphasis by the writer] without prejudice to an eventual political settlement concerning the disposition of the area”.¹⁸ “[...] it is [an] essential element of the maintenance of the cease-fire that [...] the status quo, including innocent civilian activities and the exercise of property rights be maintained in the area between the lines, subject to legitimate security requirements [emphasis by the writer] and giving due regard to humanitarian considerations”.¹⁹

The above-mentioned quotes virtually interpret UNFICYP’s mandate as laid down by SC resolutions and prescribe that (a) military activities of the two respective armies within the buffer zone are prohibited because they violate the cease-fire, and (b) innocent civilian activities and the exercise of property rights inside the buffer zone are not prohibited subject to legitimate security requirements. The question of what an “innocent civilian activity” is and what the “legitimate security requirements” are remains open.

“The Integrity of the Buffer Zone”: The 1990s

The position described above started to change at the beginning of the 1990s when the SC, the President of the SC and the Secretary-General introduced a new notion: the “integrity of the buffer zone”.²⁰ According to the Secretariat Review Team and the Secretary-General, the “integrity of the buffer zone” must be preserved from

unauthorised entry or activities by civilians.²¹ The question therefore is: what kinds of activities violate the integrity of the buffer zone? The President of the SC and the report of the Secretariat Review Team which first introduced this notion do not clarify its meaning. In order to shed some light on the meaning of the “integrity of the buffer zone” as used by the organs of the UN, and the kind of activities that violate the integrity of the zone, it is imperative to consider the relevant SC resolutions and reports of the Secretary-General where reference to the integrity of the buffer zone is made.

The SC in resolution 1062 “calls upon the military authorities on both sides to respect the integrity of the buffer zone”;²² and resolution 1092 “[...] demands that both parties prevent unauthorised incursions into the buffer zone, and respond immediately and responsibly to any demonstrations which violate the buffer zone and any demonstrations near the buffer zone that might lead to an increase in tensions”.²³

The wording of the resolutions indicates that the respect of the “integrity of the buffer zone” is relevant in so far as acts of the military are concerned and is addressed to state organs rather than individuals.

Reports of the Secretary-General state that demonstrations violate the “integrity of the buffer zone”. Indeed, each Secretary-General report relates the preservation of the integrity of the buffer zone to crowd control: “UNFICYP must also preserve the integrity of the buffer zone from unauthorised entry or activities by civilians. As a result, UNFICYP has from time to time become involved in crowd control”.²⁴ “UNFICYP did its best to prevent the demonstrators from entering the United Nations buffer zone”.²⁵

Apart from demonstrations, hunting inside the buffer zone is considered as violating its integrity according to the Secretary-General. The report states: “threats to safety and security arose as a result of hunting by Greek Cypriots in certain areas of the buffer zone during the 1992 hunting season”.²⁶ This is so because in a few cases UNFICYP soldiers were hit by a shotgun blast.²⁷

Additionally, “activities in the buffer zone that were bound to provoke the other side and that entailed the risk of incidents” also violate its integrity.²⁸

What can be deduced from the wording of the resolutions and reports is that (a) military activities, (b) demonstrations, (c) hunting and (d) activities which are bound to provoke the other side violate the “integrity of the buffer zone”. It could be argued that the above activities are not “innocent civilian activities”. Could it be argued that civilian activities which do not fall within the above mentioned ones are “innocent” and as such not prohibited inside the buffer zone?

The Reports of the Commission in Relation to Demonstrations Inside the Buffer Zone

The issue of whether demonstrations are allowed to take place inside the buffer zone was briefly raised and discussed by the Commission at three applications against Turkey in 1989. Those applications are *Loizidou v. Turkey*²⁹ and *Metropolitan Chrysostomos and Archimandrite Georgios Papachrysostomou v. Turkey*.³⁰ The first applicant participated in the demonstration of 19 March 1989 and the second and third applicants in the demonstration of 19 July 1989. All applicants crossed the buffer and having crossed the buffer zone, were arrested in the occupied part of Cyprus by Turkish-Cypriot policemen. In the course of examining whether the applicants were deprived of their liberty, the Commission had to examine the character (as the Commission describes it) of the demonstration.³¹ Particular weight was given to the evidence contained in the relevant reports of the Secretary-General (S/20663 and S/21010 respectively).³² The reports stipulated that the demonstrations created “considerable tension”; any entry would lead to a situation that might be difficult to control; and the Government of Cyprus must ensure the respect of the buffer zone.³³ In light of the Secretary-General’s reports, the Commission (in both its reports) concluded that the demonstration “constituted a serious threat to peace and public order on the demarcation line in Cyprus”,³⁴ thereby implying that demonstrations are not allowed to take place inside the buffer zone.

Is UNFICYP Exceeding its Mandate?

Contrary to what has been said above – that military activities, demonstrations, hunting and activities which are bound to provoke the other side are prohibited inside the buffer zone, while innocent civilian activities and the exercise of property rights are not prohibited – in practice this is not what is happening. UNFICYP allows nobody to enter the buffer zone without its permission. Certain civilian activities have been permitted by UNFICYP in the buffer zone.³⁵ Those activities however are subject to prior permission by UNFICYP which enjoys absolute discretion in this regard.

It seems that according to UNFICYP’s interpretation of its mandate, any entry into the buffer zone is prohibited presumably because it violates the cease-fire and the military status quo. The questions arising from this practice are the following: (a) Is UNFICYP exceeding its mandate as laid down by SC resolution 364 by this total and absolute ban on any entry into the buffer zone? And (b) is UNFICYP violating the human rights of those wishing to enter the buffer zone (i.e. right to move freely, right to home, right to property)?

It has to be acknowledged that nothing in the wording of the SC resolutions or the reports of the Secretary-General advocate in favour of this total and absolute

ban on any entry into the buffer zone, nor do they denote that innocent civilian activities and the exercise of property rights in the buffer zone is suspended. Even more so, it seems that the background by which UNFICYP interprets its mandate has changed dramatically the past few years. Since 1998 the Secretary-General consistently describes the situation in Cyprus as “stable”, “calm” and “benign”.³⁶ He no longer makes any reference to the “integrity of the buffer zone”.³⁷ On 23 April 2003 the Turkish/Turkish-Cypriot side opened the Ledra and Pergamos crossing points to the public for visits in both directions. Along the ceasefire lines various crossing points have been created. According to estimations by the Secretary General, approximately 13 million crossings have been recorded since the opening of the crossing points in April 2003.³⁸ The Secretary-General writes that “the situation along the ceasefire lines has remained stable. The partial lifting of restrictions on movement between the north and the south has resulted in a steady number of Cypriots regularly crossing the buffer zone with a remarkable low number of incidents”.³⁹ In addition, the Secretary General recommended the reduction of the strength and number of UNFICYP by about 30 per cent.⁴⁰ The SC endorsed this recommendation with resolution 1568.⁴¹

These developments seem to indicate that the situation in Cyprus is not as erupt as it was during the 1970s and 1980s. Thereby, the situation as it stands now, advocates against the settled practice of UNFICYP which advocates in favour of a total ban on entering the buffer zone. It seems that since UNFICYP supervises a long-standing buffer zone, they should attempt to implement and/or interpret their SC mandate in such a way as to violate civilians’ human rights to the least possible extent, beginning possibly, by putting an end to their settled practice of not allowing civilians to enter the buffer zone and exercise their property and other rights.

Notes

1. (1990) *The Blue Helmets: A Review of United Nations Peace-keeping*, 3rd Edition. New York, UN Publication, p. 149.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 150.
3. SC Res 186 (4 March 1964) establishing UNFICYP in paragraph 4 writes: “[the SC] recommends the creation with the consent of the Government of Cyprus [emphasis by the writer], of a United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus”. The latest relevant SC resolution reaffirms the view that UNFICYP’s presence in Cyprus is with the consent of the Government of Cyprus, see SC Res 1728 (15 December 2006), preamble which writes: “[the SC] noting that the Government of Cyprus is agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the island it is necessary to keep UNFICYP beyond 15 December 2006”. In any case, UNFICYP could not have been established without the

consent of the Government of Cyprus as one of the principles underlying peacekeeping operations is the consent of the government, see (1990) *The Blue Helmets*, pp. 5-6.

4. SC Res 186, paragraph 5.
5. Law on the Legal Basis of UNFICYP in Cyprus, (Νόμος Επικυρών την Συμφωνίαν την Συνομολογηθείσαν την 31ην Μαρτίου 1964 δι' Ανταλλαγής Επιστολών Μεταξύ του Γενικού Γραμματέως των Ηνωμένων Εθνών και του Υπουργού Εξωτερικών της Δημοκρατίας, την Αφορώσαν εις τον Νομικό Καθεστώς της εν Κύπρω Δυνάμεως των Ηνωμένων Εθνών, Ν. 29/1964, 25 June 1964). In the said agreement UNFICYP is described as a subsidiary organ of the UN, established by the SC. During the period of their assignment all forces of UNFICYP are international personnel under the authority of the UN and subject to the instructions of their Commander who is appointed by the Secretary-General.
6. SC Res 353 (1974).
7. The Geneva Declaration is attached in SC (29), Suppl. for July-September, 1974, S/11398.
8. Information regarding the events that took place can be found in the following UN Treaty Report [http://untreaty.un.org/cod/repertory/art98/english/rep_supp5_vol5-art98_e.pdf].
9. *The Blue Helmets*, p. 164.
10. Report of the Secretary-General in Connection with the Security Council's Comprehensive Reassessment of the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/26777, 22 November 1993, paragraph 12.
11. This is also argued by Kypros Chrysostomides in his book (2000) *The Republic of Cyprus: A Study in International Law*. The Netherlands, Kluwer Publications.
12. *The Blue Helmets*, p. 163.
13. SC Res 364 (13 December 1974) preamble. This mandate was reaffirmed in subsequent resolutions (i.e. SC Res 370, 13 June 1975, SC Res 383, 13 December 1975).
14. For example see Report of the Secretariat Review Team on the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus, S/21982, 7 December 1990, paragraph 6.
15. For example see Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus (for the period 1 June to 4 December 1989), S/21010, 7 December 1989, section A and B; S/21982, *op. cit.*, paragraph 7; Report of the Secretary-General in Connection with the Security Council's Comprehensive Reassessment of the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/26777, 22 November 1993, paragraph 7; Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus for the period 13 December 1994 to 15 June 1995, S/1995/488, 15 June 1995, section B.
16. Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus for the period from 6 June to 6 December 1976, S/12253, 9 December 1976, paragraph 19.
17. S/21982, *op. cit.*, paragraphs 9 and 10.
18. S/12253, *op. cit.*, paragraph 19.
19. *Ibid.*, paragraph 71.
20. SC Res 1062 (28 June 1996); Note by the President of the Security Council, S/21026 (14 December 1989); Secretariat Review Team, S/21982, *op. cit.*, paragraph 16.

21. S/21982, *op. cit.*, paragraph 16. See also the Report of the Secretary-General in Connection with the Security Council's Comprehensive Reassessment of the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/26777, 22 November 1993, paragraph 16.
22. SC Res 1062, paragraph 6(a).
23. SC Res 1092 (1996), paragraph 4.
24. S/26777, *op. cit.*, paragraph 16.
25. Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus (for the period from 11 June to 10 December 1996), S/1996/1016, 10 December 1996, paragraph 33.
26. Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus (for the period 23 November 1993 to 31 May 1994), S/1994/680, 7 June 1994, paragraph 18.
27. Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus (for the period from 1 June to 12 December 1994), S/1994/1407, 12 December 1994, paragraph 16; Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/1998/488, 10 June 1998, paragraph 13.
28. Secretary-General Report, S/21010, *op. cit.*, paragraph 13.
29. European Commission of Human Rights, Application No. 15318/89 Titina Loizidou against Turkey, Report of the Commission, 8 July 1993.
30. European Commission of Human Rights, Application No. 15299/89 Metropolitan Chrysostomos, Bishop of Kitium against Turkey and Application No. 15300/89 Archimandrite Georgios Papachrysostomou against Turkey, Report of the Commission, 8 July 1993.
31. Loizidou Report, *op. cit.*, paragraphs 54-58; Chrysostomos and Papachrysostomou Report, *op. cit.*, paragraphs 108-110.
32. Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus (for the period 1 December 1988 to 31 May 1989), S/20663, 31 May 1989; S/21010, *op. cit.*
33. Loizidou Report, *op. cit.*, paragraph 39; Chrysostomos and Papachrysostomou Report, *op. cit.*, paragraph 42.
34. Loizidou Report, *op. cit.*, paragraph 58. Chrysostomos and Papachrysostomou Report, *op. cit.*, paragraph 110. In the Loizidou Report, the Commission quite arbitrarily proceeded that the demonstration also constituted "a violation of the arrangements [emphasis by the writer] concerning the respect of the buffer zone in Cyprus" (paragraph 82) and that "the applicant's arrest and detention were justified under Article 5 para. 1(f) [of the European Convention on Human Rights], as applied to the regime created in Cyprus by the international agreements concerning the buffer zone [emphasis by the writer]" (paragraph 83). It is not clear what arrangements and which international agreements the Commission was referring to. As has already been clarified, no formal arrangements or agreements have ever been concluded on the establishment or regulation of the buffer zone. The European Court of Human Rights in the ensuing case-law did not make any reference to this issue.
35. Those civilian activities include farming and burning of fields (see report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus (for the period from 10 June to 29 November 1999), S/1999/1203, 29 November 1999, paragraph 10); industry

and recreational activities (see Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/2000/496, 26 May 2000, paragraph 8); housing (see Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/2001/1122, 30 November 2001, paragraph 10); religious service within a buffer-zone situated cemetery and “civilian use” of a street in the old town of Nicosia (see Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/2002/1243, 15 November 2002, paragraph 11); pilgrimages by Greek Cypriots to churches in the buffer zone (Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/2007/328, 4 June 2007, paragraph 30).

36. For example see the following Secretary-General Reports on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus: S/1998/488, paragraph 2; S/1999/1203, paragraph 21; S/2000/496, paragraph 2; S/2001/1122, paragraph 2; S/2002/1243, paragraph 20; S/2003/572, paragraph 25; S/2004/427, paragraph 3; S/2005/743, paragraph 8; S/2006/931, paragraph 14; S/2007/328, paragraph 12.
37. See *ibid* for the reports referred to.
38. S/2007/328, *op. cit.*, paragraph 23.
39. Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/2003/1078, 12 November 2003, paragraph 18.
40. Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, S/2004/756, 24 September 2004, paragraphs 37 and 44.
41. SC Res 1568 (22 October 2004), paragraph 2.

Commentary Article

VOLUME 20
NUMBER 1



Tradition, What Tradition?

Panayiotis Constanti

Outsiders could be forgiven for witnessing a ‘curious tradition’ which is inflicted on the public of Cyprus before and during the Easter festivities, of which an integral part of the Greek Orthodox religious ceremonies involves the lighting of the bonfire (λαμπρατζιά); a ritual which symbolises the burning of Judas for his betrayal of Jesus Christ to the Romans. (Interestingly, the Greek Orthodox Synod has made several attempts at banning this tradition; the reason – it was considered an insult to Judaism).¹ And what of our capacity to forgive and forget? But more of that later.

Meanwhile, in many parts of the island, and in particular in the Famagusta region, this ‘tradition’ has evolved into an event with remarkable and quite extraordinary dimensions. The responsibility for managing and coordinating the activities that lead up to the lighting of the bonfire has long since been deferred to the teenage population of the rural districts in the area. Consequently, we are witnessing a situation where anarchy seems to be the order of the day.

Indeed, in a neighbouring village a young underage youth who had been transporting kindling on his scooter a few nights before, was knocked down and killed by another motorist who failed to see either him or his friend, due to the fact that the boys’ vehicles had no lights.

Feelings of disbelief and outrage are experienced at the authorities’ conspicuous absence, while scenes of unbridled adolescent mischief unfold in the various villages. For several days preceding the lighting of the bonfire (an event which is usually carried out under the auspices of the mayor during Mass on the Saturday before Easter Sunday) these youngsters are busily collecting anything that will burn and adding it to the thermopile. Following this, an inter-village competition ensues, whereby the gangs attempt to outdo one another. This is achieved by trying to produce the tallest structure in the region.

A twenty-four hour vigil later begins in case exogenous forces invade the village in order to ignite the bonfire prematurely, thereby dampening the spirit of the local youth. Members of this cohort are at an age that prohibits the driving of a vehicle of any sort, but it would appear that this is neither a disadvantage nor a barrier to their mobility, as they wantonly drive their four- and two-wheeled vehicles in and around the area, ferrying their colleagues to and from the scene. During these encroachments there is usually a fracas, involving verbal and physical exchanges, including the use of home-made explosives that would impress the average

terrorist. And all of this transpires between midnight and dawn.

Meanwhile the police authorities seem totally helpless, or perhaps inept would be a more accurate description, unable to control the events that unfold. And who can blame them, following the barrage of verbal abuse, threatening and, at times, violent behaviour of these adolescents. What chance then does the local citizenry have of either tackling this antisocial behaviour single-handedly, or even to leave the security of their homes so as to run a simple errand? How is it possible in a democratic society, for innocent people to live in fear and trepidation during a part of the year which is purported to be a religious time of mourning and respect?

Just as 'Nero fiddled while Rome burned' (no pun intended), our 'lords and masters' were sitting on their hands, while anarchy was raging among the populace. Anyone with even a modicum of vision would be concerned about how events such as this are likely to develop if they are allowed to persist without any attempt at addressing them.

How easy and effortless it is to point the finger of blame on the youth of today, without considering our culpability in this, and other events of a similar nature. We languidly blame our ills on society, conveniently obfuscating the fact that we are the elements that constitute society, and by our (in)actions tacitly condone the behaviour of the youth of Cyprus.

Easter is after all, a religious festival.

However, our religious leaders are also in-absentia, within the confines of their ivory towers, and cocooned from the realities on the ground. What are these leaders doing to bring the youth closer to the values and beliefs that religion espouses? Perhaps if the village cleric had made even a small effort to engage with the boys, not just now, but long before the situation had escalated out of hand, he may initially have seen the realities personally while also affording himself the opportunity to touch the souls of these young people. While the church service could be heard on the external loudspeaker system (another moot point), the much anticipated bonfire-lighting ceremony was executed by the Mayor, who had, up to that moment also been conspicuous by his absence.

Am I exaggerating by implying that we are witnessing the demise of community? I think not. We sit idly by in the misguided hope that someone else will put their head above the pulpit, or even more worryingly, relying on our elected officials to find the 'Holy Grail'. Meanwhile, it is business as usual as we proceed to fortify our homes at every opportunity, naively believing that we will be buttressed from the events transpiring outside. A 'couch philosophy' mentality has been

embedded into our psyche. In the comfort of our living rooms, cup of coffee in hand, we busily brainstorm over-simplistic solutions to the issues with which we are faced, while we rant incessantly about the 'others' and how 'they' are to blame for all of society's woes before zapping the TV in search of the next hedonistic experience.

Meanwhile, we still persist, nay insist, with the blessings of both the state and the church that this tradition of the annual bonfire, masquerading as a religious ritual, be allowed to continue. Local residents are tacitly expected to endure the haranguing and loutish behaviour, while within those hallowed walls the congregation is oblivious to the loud explosions echoing in the night; explosions made all the more cogent by the addition of small gas canisters to the pyrotechnic masterpiece raging around them.

By now Judas has been burnt to a cinder, and yet if we took the time for holistic reflection, in order to find answers, we would first be searching for the relevant questions. One that comes to mind is "would Jesus have punished Judas for his actions or would he have forgiven him?"

And yet we fail to see the irony – a nation that prides itself on being god-fearing and highly religious, and yet does not possess the ability to forgive.

-
1. ΣΗΜΕΡΙΝΗ, 13 April 2008 ['Simerini' – Greek-language daily published by the Dias Group].

Book Reviews

VOLUME 20

NUMBER 1



The Cyprus Issue: A Documentary History, 1878-2007

**Edited by Murat Metin Hakki
I.B. Tauris, (London, 2007) 664 pp.
ISBN: 978-1-84511-392-6**

A collection of documents on the 'Cyprus Issue' is undoubtedly timely and very worthwhile. The selection in this volume is for the most part interesting. I strongly recommend its purchase because it contains a number of important documents relating to the Cyprus issue, especially post-1960. In this review I will present the positive and negative aspects of this publication so that readers will know what to expect and what not to expect.

The aim of the book is encapsulated in the title: to provide a history of the Cyprus issue through documents covering the period 1878, when the Ottoman Empire ceded to the British Empire the right to occupy and administer Cyprus, until today, or more exactly, until 2007. This aim, however, fails in one significant area: it does not provide nearly enough documents about the period before 1960, when Cyprus became an independent republic, in other words it does not provide enough documents on the period of British rule. In fact, it only has nine documents before the Zurich-London Accords of 1959. The publication, in my view, should not have claimed to cover the period before 1960, because it fails to do so anywhere near as comprehensively as it implies in the title. Moreover, some of these documents are not published in full, such as the Treaty of Sevres, the Treaty of Lausanne and the Radcliffe Proposals, although a substantial part of the latter is included. There are no documents from the National Archives (formerly Public Records Office) in Kew Gardens, London, and other more accessible documents from the period. There should have been more documents covering issues such as the occupation of Cyprus in 1878, the introduction of a liberal constitution in 1882, the place of Cyprus in the wider scheme of the British Empire, the rise of nationalism, the efforts to cede Cyprus to Greece, the decision to retain Cyprus after World War I and to subsequently make it a crown colony in 1925, the disturbances of 1931 and the years of repressive rule, the debates over whether to cede Cyprus to Greece or not after World War II and the decision to retain it and give it a liberal constitution, the policy of 'enosis and only enosis', the decision to move the British Middle East Military Headquarters to Cyprus in 1952 and the 'never' declaration of 1954, and finally the violence of EOKA, TMT and the British¹ and the internationalisation of the Cyprus issue after 1955. In order to cover the period from 1878 until today a

minimum of two volumes would have been needed (one covering 1878-1959 and the other 1960-today), although a truly comprehensive project would have looked to publish four volumes (I: 1878-1925; II: 1926-1959; III: 1960-1974; IV: 1975-today).

Nevertheless, this volume is a valuable source for the post-1960 period, with many documents, some of which are well known but not easily accessible, while others are not so well known and even more inaccessible. In the subsequent paragraphs I wish to analyse the value of some of these documents.

An engaging collection of documents are those around 'the doctrine of necessity and Greek Cypriot justifications for certain departures from the 1960 constitution' (101-106). These highlight how 'states of exception' were legally couched by the Greek Cypriots in the wake of the intercommunal violence that erupted in December 1963.

Another intriguing set of documents are the letters exchanged between Dean Acheson, the special adviser to President Lyndon B. Johnson, and George Papandreou, the Prime Minister of Greece, in 1964 on the substance of Acheson's proposals to solve the Cyprus problem. They are compelling reading because they provide the thinking behind the US proposals and their rejection by Greece.

Also of interest is the exchange between Glafcos Clerides and Rauf Denktash, the two negotiators for the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities respectively from 1967-1974. Hakki titles this exchange 'missed opportunity' and in his 'memoirs' Clerides also makes it clear that he sees it as a missed opportunity.² Hakki, however, provides a great many more documents (139-186).

Through Hakki's inclusion of Makarios' speech at the UN in July 1974 it can be seen that he never invited the three 'Guarantor Powers' to intervene in Cyprus after the coup, a controversial point since many in Cyprus, especially supporters of DISY believe this to be the case.

A truly fascinating inclusion relates to a legal ruling on the Turkish invasion in the Supreme Court of Greece in 1979. The excerpt from decision No. 2658/79 states that the Turkish intervention was legal. Although I cannot claim legal expertise, I agree that the Turkish government had the legal right to intervene and did follow the rules preceding such an intervention, however, it could only intervene for specific purposes, namely of 're-establishing the state of affairs established by the present treaty (Treaty of Guarantee)'.³ The problem, of course, is that the state of affairs had been in a state of exception since 1963. So the Turkish invasion had no intention of re-establishing the state of affairs preceding the coup, or preceding

1963, that is the 1960 Constitution, but to place the Greek Cypriots in a position where they must agree to a new state of affairs. This is why the period between the initial invasion in July and the second operation in mid August are so important. This period, in which the Turkish government hoped to compel the Greek Cypriots to accept a new state of affairs, which would include geographic separation, was a small window, owing to the tactical and logistical requirements of a military operation. So when the Greek Cypriots, represented by Glafcos Clerides at the Geneva talks, wanted more time, the military contingencies outweighed the political.⁴ It is disappointing that there are no documents in this publication on these proposals and talks.

More recently there has been a major controversy over the wording of the High Level Agreement of 2 February 1977 and that of 19 May 1979. Those that rejected the bi-communal, bi-zonal federation that was the so-called Annan Plan, namely members of DIKO, EDEK and EUROKO claim that the word bi-zonal is not mentioned in the High Level Agreements. They claim, therefore, that the Greek Cypriot side has never agreed to a bi-zonal federation. The opposing side, that is, the supporters of the Annan Plan, namely DISY, and those that support it as a basis for a solution, namely AKEL, argue that the word may not be mentioned but the High Level Agreements clearly outline a bi-zonal federation. It is true that the High Level Agreements do not use the word bi-zonal, but it is equally true that Article II of the High Level Agreement of 2 February 1977 clearly makes reference to two constituent states. It states: 'the territory under the administration of each community should be discussed in the light of economic viability or productivity and land ownership'. Since the article makes it clear that the communities will each administer territory and according to the 1960 constitution there are only two communities – the Greek and Turkish – it is therefore talking about the Greek and Turkish Cypriots having their own jurisdiction over territory and thus two constituent states.

Looking at the wider picture, one of the important qualities of this publication is the fact that the reader can compare the various initiatives to reunify Cyprus and the continuities and discontinuities from one plan to another. This is Hakki's aim in the section 'In Search for a Solution', from document 17 through to 34. For those interested in the more recent initiative to reunify the people and the island the documents from No. 27, De Cueller's Ideas to Annan V, are most interesting. There are striking continuities from De Cueller's Ideas (1986), Vasilliou's outline (1989), Boutros Ghali's Set of Ideas (1992), and the Annan Plan (2002-2004), here represented by Annan V. The similarities are in areas such as the nature of the bi-zonal, bi-communal federation, legislature, confidence building measures, constitutional safeguards and deadlock resolving mechanisms. De Cueller's set of ideas refers to the intercommunal discussions of 1982 as if the principle of

'bizonality' was an accepted fact. He also refers to a Turkish Cypriot proposed map of 5 August 1981, which Hakki should have considered including in this publication. Vasilliou's proposals, often forgotten in Cyprus today, call for the removal of all foreign troops from the island (which was foreseen in Annan III upon Turkey's entry into the EU) and for the UN Security Council to guarantee any settlement (which AKEL called for on the eve of the referendum, but which the Papadopoulos government managed to scuttle through the representations of its Foreign Minister to Russia, which voted against in the Security Council). The Ghali Set of Ideas refers to a referendum and a new partnership (state of affairs), both controversial points today given the rejection of Annan V. Again the maps accompanying the Ghali Set of Ideas and Annan V are, unfortunately, not included.

Further interesting documents include: UN Security Council Resolutions; the European Court of Human Rights; the European Court of Justice; the European Council; the European Parliament; and the European Commission. The subjects vary from various legal cases, to recognition of the 'Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC)' and Cyprus' application to, and eventual entry into, the European Union (EU).

There are two, however, major concerns about the presentation of the documents. The first is that it is not stated where they were originally published or whether the author has obtained the text from the original source. A good example of this is the Akritas Plan, which was first published in Greek in Patris newspaper in 1966. It was subsequently included by Glafcos Clerides in his memoirs (in both Greek and English), although it is not clear if his version is from an original, possible because he was one of the founders, or from Patris (or whether they are identical).⁵ Hakki's version could very well be that from Clerides' memoirs (they are virtually identical) and not a translation of the original or that from Patris.

My second major concern relates to Hakki's commentary. In the 'Preface' Hakki claims that the Cyprus dispute has its roots in 1878, when the ethnic rivalries began to emerge after the Ottomans left and the island became a British colony. Firstly, Cyprus did not become a British colony until 1925. Secondly, the rivalries (I will not call them ethnic) between Orthodox Christian and Muslim did not begin to emerge until after 1910.⁶ The Cyprus issue, Hakki further claims, has been extensively written about by historians, but very few historians have actually examined the period 1878 to 1940.

More problematic and occasionally annoying is the commentary thrown in at various times throughout the text without any consistency and often without any supporting evidence or secondary literature. On page 97, for example, Hakki comments on the crisis of 1964 that culminated in President Lyndon B. Johnson

sending a veiled warning to his Turkish counterpart against launching an invasion of Cyprus. Hakki claims that Inonu was aware that the Turkish army did not have the capabilities to invade Cyprus and that Johnson's letter was 'arrogant'. Hakki does not provide any evidence to support his assertion that Inonu was led to believe that the Turkish army did not have the capabilities to invade Cyprus and his interpretation of Johnson's letter is a matter of interpretation. Having closely read the letter there is no hint of arrogance, but a man deeply concerned at the real and present prospect of war between Greece and Turkey and upset at the Turkish threats of war because there had not been consultation with its NATO partners.

The publication should have been accompanied by a detailed and fully referenced introduction, which would have included a discussion of the historical context of the documents to follow and the aim in selecting them over others. Despite this and other disappointments, the book is without question extremely useful to all those who wish to have the most vital documents on the post-1960 Cyprus issue at hand.

Andrekos Varnava

-
1. For example, both Greece and Great Britain lodged proceedings against each other relating to the violence in Cyprus with The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) in Strasbourg, which was established under the European Convention on Human Rights of 1950. See for discussion A.W. Brian Simpson, *Human Rights and the End of Empire: Britain and the Genesis of the European Convention* (2001) Oxford, pp. 884-1052.
 2. Glafcos Clerides, *Cyprus: My Deposition, II* (1989) Nicosia, pp. 357-360.
 3. Hakki, p. 40.
 4. Makarios Droushiotis, *Cyprus 1974* (2006) Bibliopolis.
 5. Glafcos Clerides, *Cyprus: My Deposition, I* (1989) Nicosia, pp. 207-219.
 6. Andrekos Varnava, *Cyprus in the British Imperial Structure, 1878-1915: The Inconsequential Possession*, Manchester University Press, forthcoming December 2008.

Legal Aspects of the Cyprus Problem: Annan Plan and EU Accession

Frank Hoffmeister

Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, (The Netherlands, 2006) 289 pp.

ISBN: 90-04-15223-7

Frank Hoffmeister's study contends with a variety of questions of concern relating to core issues of the Cyprus problem from an international law and EU law perspective, and forms a valuable contribution to the literature on this subject. As a member of the European Commission Legal Service who participated in the Annan Plan negotiations on Cyprus, the author provides valuable information and assessment which is very useful in understanding ongoing discussions about the Cyprus problem. Following a general introduction, the author addresses the international legal dimensions of the Cyprus problem under different headings to each of which he devotes a separate chapter: The independence of Cyprus; the breakdown of the bi-communal Republic; the Turkish intervention and Turkey's continued presence in the northern part of Cyprus; UN efforts to foster a political settlement from 1975-1995; Cyprus as a candidate for EU membership; EU accession negotiations and Annan Plans I-III; EU accession and Annan Plans IV-V; Cyprus as an EU member state; and relations between Cyprus and Turkey. The manner in which these chapters are formulated makes it easier to understand complex topics. Each chapter includes only two main sections, which are "the facts" and "legal evaluation". At the end of each chapter there is a summary sub-section which assists readers to make an overall assessment on that chapter topic. This methodology employed by the author allows readers, particularly those who do not possess a legal background, to identify the central discussion on the topic.

Through the first four chapters the author examines the period between 1960 and 1998, and illustrates sources of the Cyprus problem from a legal viewpoint. In the first chapter the nature of self-determination applied in the island and the distinctive character (bi-communalism) of the 1960 Republic of Cyprus are explained. As to the collapse of the 1960 Republic the author presents in the second chapter a novel explanation and argues that some measures taken by the Greek Cypriot members of the Cypriot Government following 1964 were not justified under the law of necessity and that an unconstitutional situation existed due to the fact that the Turkish Cypriot elected parliamentarians were impeded from returning to the legislative body. However, according to the author "the partial illegal hellenisation of the Republic" did not affect the existence of the Republic of Cyprus

as a state (p. 33). In the third chapter, where all relevant sources are examined, the author acknowledges that it is possible for a state to accept an *ex ante* invitation to other states to intervene, as is the case in Cyprus' Treaty of Guarantee (p. 44). While he concludes that due to Turkey's failure to re-establish the status quo ante the second phase of the Turkish intervention in 1974 violated international law with regard to the prohibition of use of force, he also argues that despite Turkey's continuing military presence in northern Cyprus, certain "legal acts of the TRNC can be regarded as valid in international law if their non-recognition would work to the detriment of the population in the north" (p. 59). In the fourth chapter the author puts forward an assessment which has been acknowledged tacitly but has never been expressed with such clarity by international lawyers in the past. According to Hoffmeister, the 1977 and 1979 High-Level Agreements (and probably the 8 July 2006 Agreement which was concluded following the publication of the book) as well as UN documents (including Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, and reports of the Secretary General on Cyprus) are not legally binding. This point is very important since both Greek Cypriots (before the 2004 referenda) and Turkish Cypriots (after the 2004 referenda) have relied on UN documents and/or the High-Level Agreements to support their respective political positions. Despite this assessment on the legal character of these UN documents and High Level Agreements, the author does underline their importance at a given time "as a political framework for a settlement" which can be amended to adapt to changes in circumstances over time (p. 74).

It is in chapter five that the author discusses thoroughly conflicting legal arguments of both parties which were prepared through international lawyers on the legality of Cyprus' EU accession before the Treaty of Accession was signed. He concludes that the Treaty of Guarantee did not outlaw the membership of Cyprus to an international organisation (such as the EU) as was contended by Turkey and the Turkish Cypriot leadership. Following a very detailed and comprehensive analysis on the content and legal nature of the first three versions of the Annan Plan, the author states that "the plan was consistent with all relevant UN Security Council Resolutions" (p. 161). While accepting some features of the Plan as uncommon in the European Union he argues that its provisions were not in conflict with "the common EU standards" (p. 160), such as democracy, rule of law, respect for human rights, ability to speak with one voice and ability to implement and enforce EU law. The reader can find well-explained comparisons between the provisions of the first three versions of the Plan and the above-mentioned principles of the EU in chapter six. A similar methodology was applied in the following chapter, in addition to a summary of amendments made in the final version of the Plan during the Bürgenstock negotiations. It is worth mentioning that he states that "trying to justify the Greek Cypriot rejection of the plan with shortcomings as regards its EU compatibility or procedural defects under international law is not well founded." For

the author, such attempts rather show the unwillingness of the Greek Cypriot leadership to accept such a Plan “where EU accession was already secured for Cyprus” (p. 194).

Two significant issues are discussed in chapter eight: a) meaning of the suspension of the EU *acquis*; b) certain secondary EU legislation (such as regulations) on the regime of the Green Line and regarding Turkish Cypriots. As a legal expert who has been involved in the EU processes on Cyprus, points raised and interpretations made by the author regarding the meaning of the suspension is vital in the sense that most of the continuing legal discussions in and outside the island relate to this meaning. One may recall the *Orams Case* which has been sent by the British Court of Appeal to the European Court of Justice for interpretation and which concerned the question of immovable properties in the north, an area where EU law is suspended. It can be argued that the categories created by the author regarding the rights of Turkish Cypriots under EU law (‘Rights linked to territorial application of EU law’ and ‘rights not linked to territory’) will help other legal practitioners in understanding and appropriately applying EU law in the event that no settlement is reached on the island (pp. 208-213). His analysis about the second issue (regulations), particularly on the direct trade regulation and the legality of using the ports located in the north of Cyprus, conflicts with the consistent position of the Greek Cypriot government and brings us to the conclusion that the author is influential on the legal position of the European Commission. It was confirmed following the publication of this book that the author was right in his predictions on the supremacy of EU law over the Cypriot constitution and on the consistency of the legal regime established for the Turkish Cypriot properties in the south of Cyprus with the accepted human rights standards.

In analysing the relations between Cyprus and Turkey in chapter nine the author concludes that what was required from Turkey in the proper operation of the EU-Turkey customs union was to lift restrictions for ships sailing under the Cypriot flag to Turkish ports, but not to “recognize that the Republic of Cyprus legally governs the entire island” (pp. 231-232). However in his view the counter declaration issued by the EU asked Turkey to recognise the Republic of Cyprus as soon as possible in the accession process. The overall conclusion in chapter ten ends with a remarkable brief assessment which includes the following intelligent question in its introductory part: “In view of the failure of the concerted EU/UN effort, will Cyprus continue to be a ‘diplomat’s grave’ – and if I may add – an ‘international and European Lawyer’s goldmine’?” (p. 239). The author believes that international law and European law provide the framework parameters for a Cyprus settlement and underlines that the elements of compromise are still on the table.

One (including the reviewer) may disagree with or even criticise some of the points raised in this book, however, it is very difficult to deny Hoffmeister’s impartial

approach in general. It is still more important to acknowledge and credit Hoffmeister for his ability to simultaneously leave aside any concern to be 'balanced' in his technical and legal examinations. I think it is this distinctive feature that most differentiates this book from others of a similar kind and makes it a truly admirable work on the legal dimensions of the Cyprus problem.

Kudret Özersay

Update on the Cyprus Conflict

Clement Dodd

The Eothen Press, (Huntingdon, Cambs, 2006) iv + 59 + 8 pp

ISBN: 0-906719-65-8

Cyprus has always been contrarian. It is an example of ethnic conflict before its time. It is considered an anachronism in having the “last divided capital in Europe”. And, so it attracts contrarian thinkers. However, contrarian thinking can come full circle and become mainstream. Whether these prospects appeal to Professor Clement Dodd is something he would have to answer for himself, but his view that Cyprus can only be settled through a confederal model is certain to appeal to a wider constituency as time passes. It could be argued that the election of Dimitris Christofias as President of the Republic of Cyprus is a last gap effort to stave off this eventuality.

Update on the Cyprus Conflict and its Addendum is a compilation of briefings on developments regarding the Cyprus problem provided by Professor Clement Dodd to the Turkish Area Study Group (TASG) spanning from the Spring of 2003 through January 2007. Professor Dodd chronicles the developments related to the failed Annan Plan and its aftermath, the EU accession of Cyprus, and resulting complications in Turkey’s own bid to join the union. Throughout, Dodd remains steadfast in arguing that the optimal settlement for Cyprus would be a confederal system. The Updates have been reproduced in the form of a booklet (and addendum) for dissemination to a broader public.

Dodd remains faithful to the Turkish line that the current Cyprus conflict has its origins in the fateful UN Security Council resolution of March 1964 that granted recognition to a de facto Greek Cypriot government. It follows that the Turkish Cypriots “naturally distrust the Security Council” (p. 1). Dodd appears baffled at the discrepancies that emerged between Turkish Cypriot civil society and officialdom regarding the Annan Plan. How could the Turkish Cypriots have placed so much faith in the UN and other international actors that have failed to acknowledge Turkish Cypriot political equality? His patronising answer is that support for the Annan Plan derived from ignorance and economic scarcity. An educated reading of the UN plan ostensibly reveals how inimical it was in terms of Turkish Cypriot interests. The Annan Plan was not sufficiently confederal.

Dodd’s analysis of domestic Turkish Cypriot political affairs suffers from the conflation of official discourses and Turkish Cypriot political identity. This

assumption of homogeneity stems from the unexplored narratives that favoured federalism over confederalism in the run up to the Annan Plan. It should be recalled that the Turkish side's official stance in favour of confederation in 1998 was in response to the EU's Luxembourg summit strategic decision to admit Cyprus but to exclude Turkey from membership. It follows that opposition groups in northern Cyprus also understood that the EU's reversal through the Helsinki summit decision of 1999 to offer Turkey candidate status required a parallel shift in Turkish policy regarding Cyprus, in turn. The upshot was that Rauf Denktash, the veteran community leader and president of the 'TRNC', came under sustained international and domestic pressure to resume negotiations to solve the Cyprus problem in time for EU accession. Denktash eventually became a lightning rod attracting critics and leading to consternation regarding the failure to finalise negotiations. The period leading to the Annan Plan referendum polarised Turkish Cypriot society, pitting Denktash and his supporters against an increasingly wide coalition of forces that considered him to be among the primary impediments to a settlement that supposedly served the interests of Turkish Cypriots and Turkey alike. Unfortunately this account is entirely ignored in Clement Dodd's analysis.

Professor Dodd's interpretation of Turkish Cypriot domestic developments apparently stems from the official sources that he depended upon to produce the Updates, hence the partisan nature of his analysis. The booklet is littered with adjectives to describe figures and movements opposed to Denktash's policies. Mustafa Akinci and the left wing parties are often dubbed "anti-Turkish". The Chamber of Commerce leadership is referred to as "bourgeois".

The treatment of the failure of the Turkish Cypriot parliament to make a quorum prior to a critical summit at The Hague in March 2003 is telling:

"[Denktash] did not get support from the Turkish Cypriot parliament. Not confident, it would seem, that they would get the parliamentary support needed, particularly from the junior coalition Democratic Party deputies, the two government coalition parties decided not to attend the parliamentary session, thus preventing a quorum" (p. 10).

In fact, the failure to make a quorum on 3 March 2003 actually proved to be a catalyst that consolidated the coalition of forces in favour of the Annan Plan. Henceforth, the holding of a referendum took on symbolic significance aside from the substantive matter of solving the Cyprus problem. Had Professor Dodd scanned Turkish Cypriot media coverage during the period he would have been aware that the failure to make a quorum, far from tying Denktash's hands, freed him to reject the Annan Plan despite popular appeals to hold the referendum.

The shortcomings of Professor Dodd's analysis of Turkish Cypriot domestic politics aside, the ambiguity surrounding the post-referenda developments do not bode well for a federal settlement. Dodd is correct in noting a decided shift in tone and tactics on the part of Mehmet Ali Talat, Denktash's erstwhile nemesis during the Annan Plan debate, and current 'TRNC' president. He is also correct to point out that Talat's legitimacy had initially been bolstered by the EU and international community's pledges to lift the 'isolation' of the Turkish Cypriot community, if not state. Moreover, the price for lifting the embargoes was forsaking secessionism.

Clement Dodd's verdict that the UN Secretary General's report following the Annan Plan entailed flawed logic is also correct. Annan's view that the isolation be lifted given the Turkish Cypriot rejection of the two state solution is as conjectural as his conclusion that the Greek Cypriot "no" implied that the Greeks Cypriots had not only rejected the Annan Plan but any settlement. Indeed, the Turkish Cypriots had not consciously rejected sovereignty, but had accepted what they considered a viable settlement deal. But where Dodd errs is in his conclusion that Turkish Cypriots "voted under duress" (p. 35). To the contrary, many considered their vote to be an act of self-determination, despite the fact that the plan did not provide the community with 'inherent constitutive power'. It is only after the fact that Annan weighed in with his interpretation of the respective "yes" and "no" results of the simultaneous referenda that rendered the Annan Plan null and void.

It is regarding the duplicity of international affairs that Dodd's argument is most persuasive. No doubt recent developments related to Kosovo will reinforce the view that the international community is plagued by inconsistencies. However, Dodd's partisan approach will not win many converts, since Greek Cypriot sympathisers are also capable of pointing to the same inconsistencies or injustices and engaging in attribution regarding their own cause. A proper account would also weigh the contribution of Turkey to the Cyprus problem imbroglio.

But regardless of attribution, what needs to be considered is whether Professor Dodd is ultimately correct in essentialising the Cyprus conflict? After all, is the Cyprus problem not reducible to two ethnically defined sides that pursue incompatible objectives? As with any debate, there are at least two views.

On the one hand, recent evidence supports that the peoples in Cyprus are not too keen on a federal settlement, notwithstanding the implications of the recent electoral defeat of President Tassos Papadopoulos. Professor Dodd points to some of the survey and polling evidence. Problematically, it is the Greek Cypriot majority that is least interested in federalism. Their preferred ideal settlement is based on a unitary state model. Moreover, to the extent that there is consensus in principle on governance, as reaffirmed by the UN brokered agreement in July 2006 to restart

negotiations with the goal of establishing a federal system, 'political equality' (hence power sharing) remains a contested concept. From this vantage point, there may be more homogeneity within the respective communities than division. Hence, the ethnic cleavage dominates and cross cuts all other issues. In this way it is perhaps possible to reduce public opinion to official level discourses and positions, even at the cost of concealing internal ideational divisions and marginalising dissenting voices.

On the other hand, the impasse in Cyprus may have reached a crossroads. Dodd can be excused for downplaying this potential, as polling data and political allegiances in the Greek Cypriot community did not convey a sense of change. The defeat of Tassos Papadopoulos in the first round of voting in the Presidential election of February 2008 was even a surprise among Greek Cypriots.

Professor Dodd notes a growing tendency for some Greek Cypriots to prefer a two-state model to federation, but concludes that "unfortunately, with continuing Greek Cypriot insistence on their sovereignty over the island, it looks at present the least likely option" (p. 38).

But, then again, as we have seen with his analysis of Turkish Cypriot affairs, Dodd tends to underestimate dynamism, failing to recognise the schism between AKEL and Papadopoulos. On the strength of DIKO's showing in the 2006 parliamentary poll, Dodd concluded that "AKEL will probably join DIKO in nominating Papadopoulos as a candidate for a further term in 2008" (Addendum, p. 3).

Papadopoulos' legitimacy was in part contingent on his ability to produce a settlement framework more amenable to the Greek Cypriot community's interests than the Annan Plan ostensibly was. AKEL's decision to support its own candidate, Dimitris Christofias, reflected a growing schism between DIKO and AKEL over strategy amid heightened fears that Papadopoulos' policies were merely cementing division.

If there is belated momentum, the Annan Plan may have been a harbinger of changes to come in thinking on either side of the Green Line. The election of Dimitris Christofias provides a window of opportunity to refocus on substantive negotiations with a view to establishing a federal system in Cyprus. This will, at least for the time being, put the Kososvo 'precedent' on the backburner.

Erol Kaymak

The Memory of a Good Coffee

Cultures of Memory / Memories of Culture

Editor Stephanos Stephanides

University of Nicosia Press, (Cyprus, 2007) xii + 355 pp.

ISBN: 978-9963-8758-2-5

Coffee House Embellishments

Nicos Philippou

University of Nicosia Press, (Cyprus, 2007) 111 pp.

ISBN: 978-9963-634-47-7

The recently renamed University of Nicosia Press has two splendid titles to celebrate its naming. In **Cultures of Memory** edited by Stephanos Stephanides there is an eclectic collection of prose and poetry which brings to life the woes and ecstasies of separation and union, memories and hopes. The blend of academic treatments from a wide range of backgrounds and nationalities produces a set of diverse yet coherent readings whose strength is in their bipartisan realisation of loss and humanity.

Stephanides does a very good job of bringing together stories, analysis and hope which for me were grounded in optimism in the change, surprise and disappointment that the world offers us all. The book opens with the temporal riddle of Stephanides own chapter; Nostalgia for the Future and offers us the possibility of finding ourselves not in the narrative of fact and fiction of lies and counter-accusations but in poetry where the unspoken has a power of its own. This chapter is the cornerstone for the rest of the book and shines upon the other chapters in rays of possibilities for our being which are all too often allowed to be homogenised in seeking tranquillity.

Building on this chapter, the book expands its scope into a discussion on law, politics, poetics, identity and place. In so doing its appeal widens to engage a multi-disciplinary audience. Although there are many excellent contributions, two stood out for me. The first was John Nassari's Post Memory Blues where he discusses postmemory, the experience of those who have grown up burdened by stories of past traumatic events. This biographical analysis of nostalgia and exilic identity of a Cypriot evokes strong images of despair, longing and reconstituted historical dialectic. Nassari's well researched and compelling paper concludes by warning

about the appropriation of the term postmemory and so offers a simple and ready-made frame for discussion, exploration and resolution.

My second selected paper shares the same scholarly attention as Nassari's. Giuseppe Martella's contribution is a chapter entitled *Dislocations of Memory: (Post)modern Narrative*. This is an insightful investigation of the nature of technological existence and its enframing of our cultural memory. Using Georg Sebal's *The Emigrants*, Martella illustrates dislocation of our memory of our authentic being by replacement and reproduction of a consumerist fetishist ideal of existence. The selection of just these two papers comes from my own curiosity and is no reflection on the quality of the other papers. This book is equally good as a concerted read or for pick-and-mixing as the topics appeal.

This book is worth a place in the bookshelves of academics and non-academics alike, for it offers an insight into the surveillance of our society by others while looking back in the mirror of the future.

What a treat the second book, **Coffee House Embellishments** by Nicos Philippou, was. This insightful collection of images from the coffee shops lacks pretension and has charm a-plenty. Philippou's narrative and visual discourse is enlightening. He brings us into the kafeneion by way of the accounts of those who have witnessed the emergence of the political, social and economic changes of Cyprus, which reveal much of what is unspokenly known to Cypriots but hidden to many foreigners. Philippou's introduction is more interesting than scholarly and is of more value for that. His odyssey through the kafeneia and his commentary on their political alignments, their central cultural role and their historical social exclusions creates an expectation of the photographs to follow. This expectation is more than met.

The candidness of the photographs is never intrusive but the images are revealing of a culture of divergent ideologies sitting happily in their potential contradiction. Images of saints sit alongside Baghdadis, Ché and local football teams. Sports trophies find a space among the vodka and whisky bottles and visible electric wires act as veins to the television and the radio. Local heroes of the past share pride of place with the iconic images of communism and the church. The impression is of places where people dwell, not of the artificial neatness of the hotel room or government office, but reflecting the functionality of their communities.

This book is a treasure and one that the Tourist Board of Cyprus would do well to have translated and given to all tourists visiting this country. My much-thumbed copies are always positioned in our guest bedroom and in my local syllogos. A book well worth reading, viewing and reflecting upon.

Paul Gibbs

Contentious Issues of Security and the Future of Turkey

Edited by Nursin Atesoglu Guney
Ashgate, (Burlington, Vt., 2007) xvii +197 pp.
ISBN: 978-0-7546-4931-1

This very thoughtful volume on security issues and Turkey's future is a tribute to the maturity and trenchancy of Turkish scholarship on the subject. We found the analysis of the Caucasus and of Turkey's relationship to the "two Wests" (the US and EU), Russia and energy resource development (oil and gas) particularly helpful. At the same time, the volume also reveals certain weaknesses in approach which must be considered. Two minor flaws should perhaps be noted. H. Sonmez Atesoglu errs in listing Albania, Kosovo, and Macedonia as "ex-Soviet republics" (p. 154) and typographical errors sometimes confuse the reader on pp. 6, 7, and 107. Finally, the Glossary is very helpful but it would also be useful to have the bibliography list the full names of authors.

The first analytical weakness is the lack of non-Turkish contributors since only two are included and they are both American (Mowle, Ch. 2 and Winrow, Ch. 5). Where are the British, French, German, and Greek specialists on Turkish foreign policy? If there are any national proclivities in Turkish scholarship they could have been offset by inclusion of other national experts on this very sensitive and controversial subject of Turkish foreign policy. One notes between the lines that some contributors are partial to the elite secularist Republican People's Party (CHP), while others support the Justice and Development (AKP) Party. Thus Aysegul Sever suggests gently (p. 82) the need for "democratization" and "economic progress" as part of Turkey's progress toward partnership with both the US and EU. Similarly, Ozden Zeynep Oktav quotes Hakan Yavuz who argues the need in Turkey of "promoting pluralism and democracy" (p. 90). This need was demonstrated to us last July when we were privileged to watch the Turkish elections in which the "democracy pole" in Turkish politics won a resounding victory over the elite "secularist" pole of Turkish domestic politics in the resounding AKP victory with the Army, guarantor of Turkish secularism, remaining in its barracks despite some public grumblings on its website. It remains to be seen if the two "poles" of Turkish politics can be reconciled as Turkey hopefully moves toward a unitary democratic state with a good chance of entering the EU.

Moreover, in discussing the Armenian issue, most contributors describe it as an "alleged genocide" as in Mahmut Bali Aykan's Ch. 4. This author gives the essential

dates and even considers the current “hot button issue” of “modern Turkey’s perceived oppression of her Kurdish populations and undemocratic treatment of her non-Muslim minority citizens” (p. 55). He correctly notes Washington’s refusal to press these issues or even the date (24 April 1915). This takes a good deal of intellectual courage and is to be commended.

But there was nothing “alleged” about what happened in 1915, before the founding of the Turkish Republic, any more than there is about US policy toward the American Indians at Wounded Knee or the “Trail of Tears”. It is a further tribute to the maturation of Turkish political culture that many intellectuals (e.g., Orhan Pamuk) have begun to raise the issue despite the threat of criminal action against them.

More serious analytically, however, is a seeming reluctance to consider the policy impact of the undoubtedly constructive Turkish Government participation in NATO and other military (hard power) contributions. One reads a detailed list of such Turkish military contributions without very much consideration of the effectiveness of NATO, ISAF, and other foreign policy actions.¹ Thus H. Sonmez Atesoglu correctly notes in Ch. 10 (p. 151) that he adopts “a realist approach” in assessing the “future of Greece and Turkey”. We suggest that this “realist approach” is used throughout the book by all contributors even in the otherwise trenchant Ch. 7 by Visne Korkmaz on the security environment of Eurasia. This is the only place in the book where we could find any reference to Professor Joseph S. Nye’s path breaking concept of “soft power” mentioned and that is in terms of EU policy preferences (p. 106).²

But the “fatal flaw” of “hard power” realism as a “single-factor” explanation is that it overstresses military force and thus is not really “realistic”. For as this text and Professor Korkmaz herself trenchantly shows, there are severe limitations on the effectiveness of military force to solve political problems. Throughout the book very effective criticisms of US policy in Iraq are offered and Nye notes the vital role which NATO and the Marshall Plan played in the revival of Europe after World War II. One can also see in our text clear and trenchant critiques of US policy in Iraq which is one of the many strengths of the text. But the frequent mention of Turkish contributions to NATO and other military forces often neglects an assessment of their political or even military effectiveness.

One could also mention the failure of Israeli policy in Lebanon against Hezbollah, against Hamas in the Gaza Strip or even Turkish policy in its Southeast in dealing with the terrorist PKK. Thus a “realist” military policy, especially a unilateral military policy is often strikingly ineffective against terrorist threats. Nye suggests as an essential adjunct to military “hard” power what professors Nitin

Nohria and Anthony Mayo term “contextual intelligence”. This is defined as “the intuitive diagnostic skill that helps ... align tactics with objectives to create smart strategies in varying situations”. Thus our text seems to lack a fundamental “realism” in leaving out both “soft power” and “contextual intelligence.”

A final weakness of Professor Korkmaz’s otherwise very trenchant Ch. 7 on the “Fluctuating Security Environment of Eurasia” is her brief beginning analysis of Sir Halford Mackinder’s definitions of “Eurasia”. She early concedes his definitions are “ductile” (f.n. 1, p. 99). But if Mackinder is guilty of continually revising his definition in his famous study, “The Geographical Pivot of History” (1904) and the changes in Eurasia he introduced in his book published during the Versailles Peace Conference, *Democratic Ideals and Reality* – if his “Eurasia” kept changing, how can it be used as a valid metric for the definition? Professor Korkmaz carefully notes that today “Eurasia” is “slightly different” from what Mackinder projected (p. 99). And she also correctly notes that “Nowadays, the Caucasus-Central Asia is accepted as the focal point of Eurasia” (p. 99). This despite her admission that “Many analysts believe that Eurasia has no natural boundary”! But if we cannot define Eurasia, how can we use the area as the subject of our analysis?³

She also fails to consider Mackinder’s preference for sea power over land power despite the results of World War I and II in which land power clearly triumphed over sea power as witness the Red Army and D-Day in Europe. The truth is that Mackinder was a geopolitical analyst who believed in geography as a single-factor explanation of victory in warfare.

Still despite his weaknesses, Korkmaz seems to us correct in her use of Eurasia as she defines it in her most thorough analysis. Since the Turks live in this area, and have for centuries, they seem to understand the neighbourhood far better than most American and European observers.

A final chapter with which we had difficulty was that of Mustafa Turkes’ Ch. 11, “Cycles of Transformation of the Cyprus Question”. He begins with a questionable assertion, that the “so-called Annan Plan ... was the EU’s hegemonic project” (p. 159). He suggests that the Annan Plan was the last EU initiative when in fact it was developed at least officially by the United Nations under the leadership of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative. Now the actual Annan Plan approved by vote of the Turkish Cypriots (T/C’s) and rejected by the Greek Cypriots (G/C’s) on 24 April 2004, was the last of five versions, i.e. Annan Plan V. Turkes’ argument that many Greeks wished for a unitary democratic state under Greek domination can be successfully argued in our opinion. It can also be argued that Greek mainland and G/C opinion on Aphrodite’s island saw their numerical superiority (80 per cent G/C vs. 18 per cent T/C) as controlling while forgetting the

propinquity of Turkey only a short distance away. Thus the tragic history of the island can be seen as a conflict between two poles of power: numerical superiority (Greek) vs. propinquity (Turkey). This conflict led in our view to the effort of the Greek dictatorship to remove Makarios as President which in turn led to the Turkish incursion of the “July Days” of 1974. Moreover, Greek analysts often neglect the effort by Makarios of 30 November 1963 via his 13 Points unilaterally to amend the 1960 London-Zurich Agreements which gave the T/C’s an effective veto on governance of the island.

But nowhere in Turkes’ analysis does he mention numerical superiority or the fact that twice the colonial power, Great Britain, had offered Athens the entire island (once under Venizelos and once in 1915) if it would support London. Nor does he mention the Treaty of Guarantee Article IV which required an intervening Power to restore the status quo ante bellum after an intervention such as 20 July 1974. Although Ankara did consult as required by the Article, Turkey clearly violated international law by later seizing 37 per cent of the island of Aphrodite and establishing via a Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) an allegedly independent statelet, the ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus’. That this statelet was not independent in international law is clearly shown by the fact that only Turkey has recognised it to this day.

Moreover, Turkes suggests (pp. 164-166) that the EU’s then term-President, Paavo Lipponen sent Ankara a letter committing the European Union not to admit the Republic of Cyprus (ROC) to the EU unless the division of Cyprus was overcome by an agreed solution. But the EU term-President has no such power since the only authority to make such a commitment lay with the Council of the European Union representing the Member States. The term-President is responsible for the elaboration of compromise positions that integrate conflicting Member State interests. Any attempt to compel the EU to avoid admitting the ROC to the EU would have presumably faced a clear veto by Greece. Although the EU lacks a “constitution” and clear authority is not always obvious, the EU President changes every six months and is a facilitator rather than an authoritative institution. In sum, Lipponen lacked any constitutional power to compel the EU in the direction Turkes suggests.

Thus we conclude that the history of Cyprus unification negotiations is a tangled and difficult one – a series of “false dawns” as one article suggests.⁴ It may be true that the Cyprus problem is like a padlock with four keys held by the G/C’s, the T/C’s, Greece and Turkey. Perhaps current negotiations between the ROC President, Demetris Christofias and the T/C leader, Mehmet Ali Talat will be successful given the new AKP Government in Ankara and the desire of the current Athens Government for a rapprochement with Turkey. Past history does not encourage us

to be sanguine but we hope that an island-wide bizonal federated state will emerge approved by G/C's, T/C's, Turkey and Greece on a basis which meets the needs of the two poles of power discussed above and providing for a democratic Republic of all Cyprus. Only time will tell.

Glen D. Camp

-
1. For example, cf. the biting criticism of current US NATO policy by Steven Lee Myers and Thom Shanker in the New York Times of 13 March 2008, p. A6, "Conflicts Throw NATO Expansion and Bush's Trans-Atlantic Legacy, Into Doubt".
 2. For a brief exegesis of Nye's views on his soft power part of a "Liberal Realist Foreign Policy", cf. Harvard Magazine (March-April, 2008) cf. [<http://harvardmagazine.com/2008/03/toward-a-liberal-realist.html>].
 3. For a more complete discussion of Mackinder and his intellectual progeny and predecessors, cf. Howard C. Perkins, International Relations, The World Community in Transition (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 3rd Ed., 1969), pp. 40-41.
 4. See Cyprus – Another False Dawn? in the International Herald Tribune of Friday, 28 March 2008.

European Security in Transition

**Edited by Gunther Hauser and Franz Kernic
Ashgate, (Aldershot, 2006) viii + 216 pp.
ISBN: 0-7546-4961-X**

European security, its evolution and its institutionalisation has, in reaction to significant events and changes in the international environment in the post Cold War period, become a significant issue for both policy-makers and academic commentators alike. Indeed, the challenge of the new security agenda has catalysed significant change in the European security system, with the European Union (EU) seeking to enhance its status and capability as a defence and security actor. Whilst the commitment to coordinate and project a security identity in Europe has its origins in the aftermath of the Second World War, more recently, the agreement on a European Security and Defence Policy (1998) provided the momentum for the development of 'hard' capabilities to complement the EU's 'soft' power. The European Security Strategy (2003) was the first attempt to articulate the EU's ambition in developing a coherent, proactive and effective security policy across a full range of its capabilities.

Whilst there has been a clear transformation in terms of both challenges and evolution, however, the European security system in reality has not been entirely reflective of the rhetoric, strategically or politically. Whether it is internal EU coordination, interaction between the different European security providing institutions (NATO, OSCE, EU etc) or the commitment to providing military civilian and crisis management tools, important challenges remain if Europe is to develop an effective security system. This edited book by Hauser and Kernic aims to provide a broad overview of how the European security system has emerged and is evolving, and to highlight the central debates relating to its development. In this sense, it covers both history and what it sees as key issues on the security agenda, and is an introductory text aimed particularly at 'graduate and undergraduate students of the social and political sciences' (p. 1).

The book is certainly comprehensive in its coverage of history, institutions and key issues. The first chapter provides a historical overview of the emergence of European security, from the Cold War to the post-Cold War context. Beginning with the Brussels Treaty in 1948 and the failure to establish a European Defence Community in the early 1950s, it charts the evolution of the European security landscape through to the CFSP in 1992, the idea for an ESDP that emerged at St. Malo in 1998 and the European Security Strategy in 2003, the purpose of which was

to provide an overarching framework for the EU's nascent security strategy. It also alludes to the pressure for change to the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) because of the new European post-Cold War environment. Overall, the chapter points to the complexity of the post-Cold War European security landscape, incorporating both 'traditional' and more 'comprehensive' notions of security, whilst being challenged in its evolution by a constantly changing environment. The essence of the second chapter is an analysis of the 'problematic' relationships between the key security organisations in Europe: first between the EU and NATO, whereby the notion of the two organisations existing on two different planets whilst working in the same city, still seems to hold true, strategically and culturally; second, the EU and OSCE, and how the soft power of both is coordinated to work towards conflict prevention; and third, in terms of the relationship between NATO and the OSCE, and the potential limits to working together in the area of 'cooperative security'. The conclusion points to the challenge for Europe in cooperating and providing security, in particular the governance structures that are developing and continue to evolve in the enlarged EU.

The third chapter focuses on the European security pillar, from a predominantly legal but also political perspective. It provides a detailed analysis of key articles and declarations related to the evolution of CFSP and ESDP, with an emphasis on both the military and civilian aspects (and cooperation between these). It then goes on to analyse this in the context of ESDP and NATO cooperation, whilst also providing an overview of the key changes to the CFSP in the European Constitutional Treaty. The fourth chapter somewhat continues the focus on the European Constitutional Treaty for a very different purpose: to analyse its implications for the neutral and non-aligned states in the context of the ESDP framework. The fifth chapter ventures in to the 'internal aspects of external security' through an analysis of Justice and Home Affairs and demonstrates how EU cooperation in this area has evolved in terms of policy, in order to address issues such as drug trafficking, terrorism, fraud and other activities deemed to be illegal. Chapter six engages in a more substantive analysis of the European Security Strategy (ESS) adopted in 2003 by the European Council. It focuses in particular on the integrated nature of the ESS and its potential in the local and global context, whilst also reminding us of the problems in implementing and operationalising such an ambitious security framework, in particular in terms of institutionalising strategic reflection and consolidating a strategic culture.

Chapter seven moves to analyse the bilateral aspect of European security through focusing on the US transformation of its military for the purpose of addressing the 'new' security challenges of the twenty-first century. More specifically, it evaluates the implications of this transformation for European security and defence. A central argument is that European transformation is very much

based on the degree of adaptation to US operational guiding principles, but that also, US defence transformation brings with it risks for European security and defence. The central questions raised in this chapter are thus of the importance and relevance of NATO to the US and the extent to which US transformation is leading to a transatlantic divide in security and defence policy. The main conclusions are that US defence transformation should be welcomed by Europeans, that US defence transformation concepts should not in their entirety, be imported to Europe, and finally, that transformation in US defence and security requires a restructuring of the transatlantic relationship, in particular a better NATO-EU structure within the new security context. Chapter eight provides an interesting argument relating to the need for transformation of existing military and defence governance instruments and processes in order to adequately meet the security challenges of the twenty-first century. This, it is asserted, should be manifest in a shift from the traditional state-centric approach to security, to a network-centric approach that produces 'a strategic, multinational, multilevel, and future-orientated interagency process that helps increase the coherent use of diplomatic, informational, economic and military instruments of power' (p. 133).

Chapter nine discusses the regional aspects of security in Europe, and provides examples of regional security cooperation arrangements as well as describing the way in which the European Neighbourhood Policy 'fits' into and is part of the more comprehensive regional security framework. Chapter ten moves the discussion to the South Caucasus, with an analysis of the security issues emanating from Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan. It focuses particularly on the role of Russia in the ethno-territorial conflicts within these countries, and in relation to the increasingly significant issue of economic (read energy) security. Chapter eleven analyses Turkey's importance in the evolving European security architecture in the new security context: a role it argues would become even more significant and effective were Turkey to join the EU. Separated into two parts, it first establishes the importance of the Turkish role in European security in the post-9/11 milieu, and then focuses on the impact of 9/11 on European security, and Turkey's role therein. The importance of Turkey within European security, of course, cannot be underestimated, in particular for the eastern Mediterranean. A positive institutionalisation of Turkey within European security institutions (including the EU) might facilitate the resolution of various disputes and conflicts that currently constrain the effective and cohesive functioning of security policy across a range of issues and organisations. It might also provide the basis for more positive relations to evolve in the Cyprus issue, which will, of course, be of particular relevance and importance to the readers of this journal. Of course, in the current context, there are constraints to realising Turkey's integration into European security structures, especially the EU. However, it becomes even more pertinent that these are addressed if Turkey is to become an active partner in resolving security disputes

that it is involved in, and if it is to help address the broader security threats that face the EU. Seeing Turkey as more than just the 'other' that acts as a buffer to secure threats, but as an equal partner in the European security architecture (p. 173), would certainly be a constructive starting point for this to occur. Chapter twelve focuses on an analysis of the EU's role in the Greater Middle East. It argues specifically that the EU should play a greater political role and gain more visibility in the Middle East and that it should present an alternative to the US approach in the region, especially in efforts to resolve the Israel-Palestine conflict. It offers a critical evaluation of the EU in its actions and approach and concludes that it has been hampered in its effectiveness by its inability to speak with one voice or act as a single actor. The final, concluding chapter, attempts to draw the different strands of the book together, highlighting the remaining difficulties and challenges for the European security system and the institutions, actors and processes within its architecture. Inevitably, it raises more questions for future research in European security, in particular with respect to the flexibility, coordination and thus effectiveness of Europe's overlapping and security infrastructure.

In summary, what is immediately noticeable about the collection of essays in this book is that the contributors are both practitioners from military institutions, as well as researchers from think tanks within Europe. This is a positive feature of the book that enables thorough and empirically detailed discussion and analyses to emerge of some of the most important issues impacting on the evolution of the European security architecture, with the individual chapters providing well-researched, interesting and rigorous accounts. However, if one was to be critical, one might wonder whether the absence of any overarching theoretical discussion or framework within which the analyses could be located (although individual chapters do allude to certain concepts), even loosely, is one of the core weaknesses of this edited collection. For a book aimed at undergraduates, but more importantly postgraduates, such an introductory text might well have benefited and been enriched by an overview of the theoretical literature and debates in understanding and explaining European security. Overall, if the aim of the book is to provide an overview of the European security architecture and the important issues therein, then it has been met – and I am sure it will appeal to academics, policy-makers, experts, and those with a general interest in European security.

George Christou

Call for Submissions

The Cyprus Review invites submissions for papers, which may address any topic relevant to Cyprus. We also welcome critical reviews of recent scholarly books of interest to the Island. We are interested in topics relating to the social sciences including primarily Anthropology, Business Administration, Economics, History, International Relations, Politics, Psychology, Public Administration and Sociology, and secondarily, Geography, Demography, Law and Social Welfare, pertinent to Cyprus.

Scholarly essays should be written in English and range in length between 4,000 and 9,000 words. The use of graphics or illustrations is supported where appropriate.

Please send four copies of the manuscript together with a CD or 3.5 inch disk compatible with Microsoft Word and saved as rich text format, with the author's name deleted from two copies, to

The Editors
The Cyprus Review
University of Nicosia
PO Box 24005
1700 Nicosia
Cyprus

For more information

Tel: +357 22-353702 ext 301

Fax: +357 22-353682

E-mail : cy_review@unic.ac.cy

THE CYPRUS REVIEW (TCR)

Subscription Invoice

Volume 20, Number 1, 2008 and Volume 20, Number 2, 2008

Payment is Due in Advance

Please Complete the Appropriate Blanks Below

Annual Institutional Rate

Annual Personal Rate

US\$70 _____	Renewal _____	US\$48 _____
Cyp£35 (EU €59.80) _____	New Subscription _____	Cyp£18 (EU €30.76) _____
UK£48 _____		UK£24 _____
Euro€60 _____		Euro€30 _____

[1 Euro = CYP£0.585274]

From January 2008 the national currency of Cyprus is the Euro

Two and three year subscriptions are accepted at the current rate.

Single copies are available at half the annual subscription rate.

Back Issues are available (details on request).

Make cheques or bank drafts payable to

I.M.C.S. Intercollege Ltd.

Send to The Cyprus Review, University of Nicosia,

P.O. Box 24005, 1700 Nicosia, Cyprus.

For payment by bank transfer, details as follows:

Bank of Cyprus

Account Name: I.M.C.S. Intercollege Ltd.

Current Account No: 0182-11-007377

Swift Code: BCYPCY2N010

IBAN: CY35002001820000001100737700

Name/Institution _____

Address _____

City _____

State or Province _____

Country _____ Zip / Postal Zone _____

Date _____

Subscribers are requested to notify the Editors immediately of change of address.

Please give both old and new addresses.



GLOBAL DIALOGUE

Gain a deeper understanding of the forces shaping today's world



Global Dialogue is a quarterly journal offering analysis and debate on questions of international concern.

Each issue is themed, providing in-depth coverage of a specific topic. Past issues have looked at globalisation, religious pluralism, the United Nations, economic sanctions, the dialogue of civilisations, the environmental crisis, the repercussions of 11 September, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Global Dialogue features the writing of leading scholars and thinkers. Among those who have contributed to *Global Dialogue* are Helmut Schmidt, Gary Sisk, Vandana Shiva, Richard Falk, Khaled Abou El Fadl, Ahmed Khatibi, and Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala.

Global Dialogue illuminates the key political, social, cultural and economic currents underlying developments in a rapidly changing world.

**For a truly global perspective on today's issues and events,
subscribe to *Global Dialogue***

Annual rates: Individuals USD90, institutions USD192

Send subscriptions to: Global Dialogue, EO, Box 23992, CY-1067 Nicosia, Cyprus

Published by the Centre for World Dialogue [www.worlddialogue.org]

39 Riga Finsen Street, CY-1067 Nicosia, Cyprus

Telephone: 357-22511762. Fax: 357-22311752. E-mail: info@worlddialogue.org

Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans

EDITOR

Vassilis Fouskas, *Kingston University, UK*

Supported by an Editorial Board and an International Academic Board

Southern Europe and the Balkans and the Near East, as a region, is currently undergoing major geo-political and geo-economic significance, giving Mediterranean and European studies a particular immediacy and calling for a reconsideration of many widely held assumptions.

Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans is a peer-reviewed interdisciplinary journal, published with the support of the *Association for the Study of Southern Europe and the Balkans* (ASSEB) aiming at academic analysis of the region with a comparative perspective. In an increasingly globalised world, this can involve the re-examination of historical claims and of political or economic arguments concerning the geo-strategic position of the region and its individual nation-states in Europe and the world. In this context, the journal addresses, in a historically and theoretically informed way, the complex geo-political and geo-economic issues facing the Mediterranean, the Balkans and the Near East in the light of global developments and, in particular, European integration. Thus, the journal encourages comparative approaches and views, and aims to construct an academic forum to bring together different viewpoints.

This journal is also available online.

Please connect to www.tandf.co.uk/online.html for further information.

To request a sample copy please visit: www.tandf.co.uk/journals/online/sample.asp

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

2005 – Volume 7 (3 issues)

Print ISSN 1461-3190 Online ISSN 1469-963X

Institutional rate: US\$382; £232

Personal rate: US\$104; £63



Carfax Publishing
Taylor & Francis Group

ORDER FORM

cjsb

PLEASE COMPLETE IN BLOCK CAPITALS AND RETURN TO THE ADDRESS BELOW

Please invoice me at the institutional rate personal rate

Name _____

Address _____

Email _____

Please contact Customer Services at either:

Taylor & Francis Ltd, Rankine Road, Basingstoke, Hants RG24 0PR, UK

Tel: +44 (0)1256 330002 Fax: +44 (0)1256 330045 Email: enquiry@tandf.co.uk Website: www.tandf.co.uk

Taylor & Francis Inc, 325 Chestnut Street, 8th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19106, USA

Tel: +1 215 6258900 Fax: +1 215 6258914 Email: info@taylorandfrancis.com Website: www.taylorandfrancis.com

To access international literature as diverse as the study of sociology, start here.

CSA Sociological Abstracts offers a world of relevant, comprehensive, and timely bibliographical coverage. Thousands of easily-searchable abstracts enhance discovery of full-text articles in thousands of key journals from 35 countries, books, and conference papers plus citations of dissertations and other media. This continuously growing collection includes thousands of records that are updated monthly, with backfiles to 1952—plus scholar profiles, browsable indexes, and a thesaurus through the CSA Illumina® interface.

So whatever your quest, start here with CSA Sociological Abstracts.



The CSA Sociological Abstracts Discovery Prize.

Tell us how CSA Sociological Abstracts has advanced teaching and learning at your institution, and you may win the CSA Sociological Abstracts Discovery Prize.

Visit: info.csa.com/sociologicaldiscovery

CSA Sociological Abstracts

For a free trial, contact ppsales@proquest.com or log onto www.proquest.com/igufad today.

ProQuest
PQ eLibrary

Mediterranean Historical Review

EDITORS:

Irud Mulkin, *Tel Aviv University, Israel*

Benjamin Arbel, *Tel Aviv University, Israel*

Mediterranean Historical Review encourages the study of issues whose significance transcends a particular area or period. It integrates various problems in the ancient, medieval, early modern and contemporary history of the Mediterranean basin.

Mediterranean Historical Review aims to publish articles which emphasize contacts, relations and influences within the Mediterranean context as well as questions of a comparative and comparable nature.

Topics on which the journal has focused recently include:

- Defining the Mediterranean
- Cross-Cultural Contacts among Mercenary Communities in Sute and Persian Egypt
- Mediterranean Humanism
- Israeli Poetry
- Criminal Anthropology and Anarchist Terrorism in Spain and Italy.

This journal is also available online.

Please connect to www.tandf.co.uk/online.html for further information.

To request an online sample copy please visit:

www.tandf.co.uk/journals/onlineSamples.asp

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

2005 - Volume 20 (2 issues)

Print ISSN 0951-8967

Online ISSN 1743-940X

Institutional rate: US\$234; £153

Personal rate: US\$63; £41



Frank Cass

Taylor & Francis Group

ORDER FORM

fmhr

PLEASE COMPLETE IN BLOCK CAPITALS AND RETURN TO THE ADDRESS BELOW

Please invoice me at the institutional rate personal rate

Name _____

Address _____

Email _____



Register your email address at www.tandf.co.uk/eupdates to receive information on books, journals and other news within your areas of interest.

Please contact Customer Services at either:

Taylor & Francis Ltd, Rankine Road, Basingstoke, Hants RG24 8PR, UK

Taylor & Francis Inc, 325 Chestnut Street, 8th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19106, USA



The Mediterranean Institute of Gender Studies (MIGS) is a non-profit organization which promotes and contributes to projects of social, political, and economic

themes relating to gender with an emphasis on the Mediterranean region. MIGS aims to act as a main contributor to the intellectual, political, and socio-political life of the region as this relates to issues of gender and to do so using a multidisciplinary approach and in collaboration with other institutions.

MIGS' aims are to stimulate interest in gender research in the Mediterranean region and identify key areas of concern and action in the area; systematically address, analyse, and conduct research on, for, and by women; review and use existing information on women and the gender system such as research, statistical information and other available data and make relevant recommendations on policy and practices in related areas; identify the need to develop new legislation that corresponds to the new conditions and protects women's rights effectively; increase awareness of gender issues in civil society and facilitate the capacity for action by providing all interested parties with information and organizing training, campaigns, seminars, workshops, and lectures.

MIGS is actively involved, both as a coordinating institution and as a partner, in the administration and implementation of a number of projects related to issues of gender. The Institute has conducted work on interpersonal violence against women, gender and migration, gender and the media, women in the political and public life, women in economic life, and gender and civil society, among others. All MIGS projects encompass research and analysis which informs all our advocacy work and include training of relevant stakeholders including policy makers, awareness-raising campaigns, open discussion involving policy makers and beneficiaries to encourage citizen participation in decision-making, interventions in the media, and others.

For more information on MIGS' projects and activities, please visit our website at: <www.medinstgenderstudies.org>



Published by

UNIVERSITY OF NICOSIA

TYPESETTING, ELECTRONIC PAGINATION & PRINTING
BY CASSOULIDES PRINTING WORKS

