

CYPRUS: STATE CREATION WITHOUT A NATIONAL IDENTITY

A Thesis
submitted to the Faculty of
The School of Continuing Studies
and of
The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
in partial fulfillment for the requirements for the
degree of
Master of Arts in Liberal Studies

By

Byron N. Pappas, BALS

Georgetown University
Washington, D.C.
October 31, 2012

CYPRUS: STATE CREATION WITHOUT A NATIONAL IDENTITY

Byron N. Pappas, BALS

Mentor: John O. Voll, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

The Republic of Cyprus entered the international community without the benefit of election August 16, 1960, the result of an international compromise among Britain, Greece and Turkey. These powers were operating under the illusion that they could in fact create an effective government in Cyprus. The Republic of Cyprus had become a state but not a nation. Three years later civil war erupted along ethnic lines and Cyprus devolved into a partitioned state. At the time of the creation of the Cypriot constitution the framers failed to ask the essential question. What does it mean to be a Cypriot? In 1960 the Cypriot constitution identified two ethnic groups as citizens of the Republic: persons of Greek or Turkish origin. Does that mean that a citizen of Cyprus is a Cypriot Greek or a Greek Cypriot conversely a Cypriot Turk or a Turkish Cypriot? The framers of the Cypriot constitution viewed the Cypriot problem through their unique historical perspectives. Incorrect perceptions lead to improper analysis which in the realm of international politics can have catastrophic consequences.

History had denied Cyprus the opportunity to experience the process of creating nationalist ideas. Britain as the Colonial Power never identified a Cypriot but rather people of Greek or Turkish heritage. Greece and Turkey through various means projected

their cultural narratives creating two separate but politically equal competing ethnic communities. The purpose of this endeavor will be to examine the hybrid constitutional structure that was created and make the claim that the constitution in fact suppressed the potential for the development of inter-communal relations that are a necessary pre-requisite for the development of a nationalist narrative.

In order to support that claim it will necessary to develop a hybrid nationalist theorem derived primarily from the ideas of Benedict Anderson and Ernest Gellner. The topic is timely because ethnic tensions have emerged as an important element within existing states. Iraq represents one of the more recent examples of a state with a weak historical narrative and limited inter-cultural interaction. The result has been a society operating in an ethnically competitive environment subject to sustained outbursts of violence. Identifying and understanding the reasons for the failure of the first Cypriot Republic may be useful to those going forward operating in hostile environments that lack the ability to discern potential commonalities. Once discovered it may result in the planting of seeds where the opportunity for a shared cultural narrative may emerge into a nationalist narrative.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my wife Eugenia and son Alexander for their patience and understanding during this process. They have endured my ups, my downs, and my doubts about this project. I would like to acknowledge Georgetown University, an institution of incredible learning that provided an environment of thoughtful Professors dedicated to improving the human condition. I want to especially acknowledge Dr. John O. Voll, Associate Director of the Prince Alwaleed bin Tatal Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding, whose lectures were always inspiring and improved my understanding of Christian-Muslim interaction. It was he who posed the question in one of his lectures: Are you a Greek American or an American Greek which I converted into Are you a Greek Cypriot or a Cypriot Greek? Finally, Anne Ridder Assistant Dean Graduate Liberal Studies, the rock of the Liberal Studies Program, she possesses the patience of Job.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER ONE: NATIONALISM: IMAGINED OR CREATED?	10
CHAPTER TWO: CYPRUS: A CREATED STATE CONTAINING TWO NATIONS.....	32
CHAPTER THREE: MOTIVATIONS: BRITAIN, GREECE, TURKEY AND THE UNITED STATES.....	57
CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSIONS.....	88
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	99

INTRODUCTION

This thesis will concern itself with the failure of the first Cypriot Republic and the lack of a nationalist narrative at its creation. It will target specific political proposals that allowed Britain to retain sovereign control of Cyprus while offering self-government but not self-determination. This project will also examine the Zurich-Agreements which became the founding documents of the first Cypriot Republic. Specifically, the thesis is looking for evidence that the proposals and the actions of the interested parties promoted the development of a Cypriot national identity or whether the actions of Britain, Greece and Turkey worked against that idea. Nationalism and nations occur when the social elite provide a shared cultural narrative for the entire population. The most effective way to accomplish this objective is through a standardized educational system. The method of how best to approach this project follows later in this chapter but basically it requires the creation of a hybrid concept of nationalism and nations. The content of a shared cultural narrative begins with remembrances of historical experience. Since that is the case it will be necessary to provide some historical context for Cyprus.

History has proven that geographic location matters. In the case of Cyprus its location provided the opportunity of various ruling powers to control events in the Eastern Mediterranean. That has been the misfortune of Cyprus. By the first century A.D., Cyprus had experienced occupations starting with the Egyptians, then by the Greeks and finally rolled into the Roman Empire. Later, a series of occupiers held control over Cyprus: “From before the Byzantine era through successive occupations by Richard the Lionhearted, the Templers, Franks, Venetians, Turks and British, Cyprus has been

passed with abandon among ruling powers.”¹ The layers of occupation effectively suppressed the ability of the Cypriot people to develop a shared cultural heritage from which a nationalist narrative may emerge because they were in a continual state of adaptation to the newest ruling power. The various ruling powers were focused on projecting their own interests in the region.

During Ottoman rule Cypriots tended to identify themselves as either Orthodox or Muslim. The association of religion with identity did not limit social inter-action between the two groups.

There is considerable evidence of extensive intermarriage between Orthodox and Muslim and some indication of conversion from Islam to orthodoxy during the nineteenth century. In addition, the prevalence among contemporary Greek Cypriots of names of Turkish derivation lends credence to the view that the Muslim and Orthodox communities were not the closed communities that they have subsequently become.²

Interestingly ethnic identification does not seem to be present. Ottoman rule tended to be hands off meaning that the religious and secular affairs of the Orthodox population, was managed by the Orthodox clerical elite. It is an interesting blending of the affairs of church and state. The first President of the Republic of Cyprus was an Orthodox Bishop which given Cypriot history makes sense but politically may have been the worst possible choice. The power of the Orthodox clergy in Cyprus began to diminish with the

¹ Thomas Ehrlich, “Cyprus, the ‘Warlike Isle’: Origins and Elements of the Current Crisis,” *Stanford Law Review* 18, no.6 (May, 1966): 1021, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1227122>(accessed September 14, 2009).

² Adamantia Pollis, “Intergroup Conflict and British Colonial Policy: The Case of Cyprus,” *Comparative Politics* 5, no. 4(July 1973): 582, <http://jstor.org/stable/421397> (accessed January 27, 2009).

introduction the Tanzimat reforms in the mid-nineteenth century designed to reassert Ottoman power.³

The social organization during Ottoman rule divides along economic lines. The peasant classes were comprised of both religious groups, administrators or tax collectors followed a similar pattern. The elite power holders were a combination of Orthodox clergy or pashas. There was common agreement amongst the peasant class about the heavy tax burdens imposed on them which resulted in numerous violent uprisings one in particular involving the killing of a newly appointed governor of the island.⁴ Reports by travelers in the nineteenth century indicate limited social differences and were surprised by the uses of churches for both Orthodox and Muslim religious services.⁵ It appears in the waning period of Ottoman rule there existed commonalities that could have resulted in a cohesive cultural narrative.

In 1878 when the British arrived for their turn at controlling events in the Eastern Mediterranean they inherited what they perceived to be an Island colony primarily comprised of Greeks or Turks while the inhabitants viewed themselves as either Orthodox or Muslim.⁶ There were seeds of discontent within the Greek Cypriot community. Later the British when dealing with the enosis [union with Greece] movement they would reflect:

³ Ibid., 584.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid., 585.

⁶ Ibid., 579.

The enosis movement started in the middle of the nineteenth and its leaders have always been the high dignitaries of the Orthodox in Cyprus, who under Ottoman occupation became the natural leaders of their flock. When in 1878 Britain, by a convention with Turkey, took over the understanding at that time that she did so in trust for the Sultan, the movement was already flourishing.⁷

In other words the creation of the enosis movement was not their fault it was a pre-existing condition. The ultimate difficulty and source of tension for the British and the Greek and Turkish Cypriots was the politicization of ethnicity.

Britain's approach to governance was the establishment of very basic political structures that permitted limited governance at the local level and some presence of communal elites on the Colonial Governor's Council. Their purpose was to inform the communities of events or directives coming from the Colonial Governor's office. The basic political unit for the British was based on an ethnic or communal group versus the concept of a political constituency located within a defined geographic location.⁸ This approach to political organization institutionalized ethnic differences blocking off the possibility of inter-communal cultural interaction that may have produced commonalities which in turn might have created a new political paradigm. The British were not focused on such matters.

Britain's primary focus in Cyprus was projecting its' political military interests in the Eastern Mediterranean and in the Middle East. After World War II and rise of the Soviet Union, British interests expanded to include military support for the protection of

⁷ Information Department, *Chatham House Memoranda Cyprus The Dispute and Settlement*, Royal Institute of International Affairs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, June 1959), 2.

⁸ Adamantia Pollis, "Intergroup Conflict and British Colonial Policy: The Case of Cyprus," 580.

Western Europe through NATO. This meant that Cyprus in order to achieve its military objective must remain under British sovereignty. However, meeting those needs was becoming increasingly difficult because the enosis movement was limiting British military capability. This was apparent during the Suez crisis when Britain failed to retain control of the Suez. The military wing of the enosis campaign EKOA was keeping British forces occupied in the Island and therefore unable to support Middle East military operations. By 1956 Cyprus had transformed from a place of peace and tranquility to an Island full of restive inhabitants requiring the British to use 18,0000 to maintain the peace.

Ethnic tensions were undercutting Britain's ability to project its' military interests in the region. The concept of enosis was unacceptable because it would remove Britain's sovereign control over the Island. Turkey in reaction to enosis argued for partition of the Island. The British seemed sympathetic to the idea but understood that partition would require the mass movement of the Cypriot population. It did provide a political benefit to Britain because the concept of partition could be used as a backstop to Greece's position of enosis. Greece had been before the United Nations General Assembly arguing for a resolution calling for an independent Cyprus. Inter-communal tensions were negatively affecting Greek and Turkish relations thereby creating tensions within NATO. Turkey had threatened military action if enosis occurred. Such an event would fracture NATO at a time when the Soviet Union was actively engaged throughout the region. In order to retain control of the situation the British presented a number of proposals focusing on self-government but not self-determination.

Britain had calculated by 1958 that sovereign control over the entire Island was no longer necessary that sovereign base areas would be sufficient to meet its military requirements. The British invited the governments of Greece and Turkey to participate in a shared sovereignty arrangement in Cyprus with Britain retaining sovereign control over certain base areas. Greece objected to the direct participation of Turkey because it viewed the Cyprus issue as basically a Greek-British matter. The stalemate was broken when Greece and Turkey decided to engage in direct talks. In a matter of weeks a settlement was reached whereby Cyprus would become a free and independent nation without the prospect of enosis or partition. The British would be granted sovereign base areas in perpetuity. The hybrid constitution provided for a shared political power structure effectively making each community equal negating the concept of majority rule. Three years later the first Cypriot Republic collapsed.

This thesis will examine the British proposals and the reactions of Greece and Turkey. It will argue that those international actors directly involved in the Cyprus issue were motivated for unique reasons to maintain leverage in the Island and therefore not interested in creating inter-communal cooperation. Each was concerned with being British, Greek or Turkish but certainly not Cypriot. This begs the question: What does it mean to be a Cypriot? Is it really an ethnic affiliation? Does history matter? Does language matter? Was there a Cypriot national identity? The framers of the Cypriot seemed to think that ethnicity matters but the political institutionalizing of ethnicity would seem to be a political construct of exclusion not inclusion.

In order to answer these questions a theory of nationalism and nations must be created that can be used to evaluate the various attempts at resolving the Cypriot issue. The ideas of Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* and Ernest Gellner's *Nations and Nationalism* will contribute to the creation of a hybrid theorem of nationalism. Chapter One will work through their respective conceptualizations of nationalism. Anderson will take the position that nationalism has an attachment to an historical past and that that past becomes part of the construction of the nationalist narrative. As the early institutions of the church and monarchy fade away new structures emerge while retaining certain ideas from the past. Nationalist ideas evolve over time. Not true for Gellner. He will argue that society has memories of its historical past but they have no relationship to modernity. He places nationalism in the modern era. Scientific knowledge is driven by facts creating a single set of unifying facts that become the basis of a new method of thought which has multiple applications. This reality drives the need for universal standards which serve as a coalescing agent transcending cultural differences.

Chapter Two will concentrate on specific proposals and whether they align with the hybrid theorem developed in the first chapter. The 1956 Radcliffe Proposals will be the first to be examined. It was a unique and creative attempt at developing a constitution that would meet the needs of the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities. The Radcliffe constitution provides for a fair amount of political autonomy at the local level but its objective is self-governance not self-determination. British military interests are paramount to Cypriot sovereignty. In 1958 then British Prime Minister Macmillan puts

forward a new proposal that continues to link Cypriot self-governance to British military interests. He proposes a tri-condominium arrangement with Greece and Turkey. This proposal draws a clear line of political demarcation between the two communities and internationalizes the issue. The end state for Cyprus is independence operating with a constitution that institutionalizes ethnic separation and disregards the concept of majority rule. Cypriot sovereignty is contingent upon the actions of Britain, Greece and Turkey the guarantor's of the agreements.

Chapter Three will discuss the motivations of Britain, Greece, Turkey, and the United States. Each has a nationalist narrative which colors their analysis and approach in seeking a resolution to the Cypriot issue. The British had been operating with their unique nationalist for some time. A Greek nationalist identity was fully achieved with the creation of the Greek state in 1830. The Turkish narrative appeared much later during the Young Turk revolution of 1908. The United States was one of the first places where nationalism emerged. All are pre-occupied with their unique roles in the global geopolitical situation.

Finally, Chapter Four will be the concluding phase of this thesis. It will argue that the concept of a Cypriot nationality was never really contemplated although the Radcliffe Proposals come close to the hybrid theorem used in this thesis. The nationalist and nations will be restated. A brief review of the layers of history of Cyprus will be discussed with some focus on Ottoman Rule. British, Greek, and Turkish interaction will be reviewed and their failure to imagine a Cypriot national identity. Some discussion will focus on United States policy goals with respect to Cyprus. In the final analysis a

political status quo was momentarily achieved but what Cyprus demonstrates is that strong regional powers linked with a powerful international actor really don't have much influence over nationalist desires.

CHAPTER ONE

NATIONALISM: IMAGINED OR CREATED?

Nationalism and nations remains central to political legitimacy in the modern world. Nationalism creates the narrative that lays the foundation on which nations emerge. There are a number of perspectives concerning the origin of this related phenomenon. This chapter will review the conceptualizations of Benedict Anderson's *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* and Ernest Gellner's *Nations and Nationalism*. Next will be a synthesis of these two important conceptualizations into a hybrid theorem that can be used in determining the causes for the failure of the first Cypriot Republic. The theorem will state that ideas concerning nationalism and nations have a link to a specific historical past. Nationalism requires the presence of other cultures. Nations emerge from nationalistic feelings when those feelings move beyond the immediate and become inclusive of others. Ideas of nationalism and the development of nations reside in the modern historical period. Finally, the development of nationalism and nations does not have a predictive quality.

Nations as Imagined

Anderson begins his construction of a definition of nationalism by challenging Marxist theory. He makes reference to the small scale wars that took place in the early eighties among Cambodia, China, and Vietnam and seems puzzled such an event could take place among communist states. These events seem to argue against Marxist claims

that hostility among nations will subside as class struggles end. ¹Unequivocally, Anderson proclaims: “The reality is quite plain: ‘the end of nationalism’, so long prophesied, is not remotely in sight. Indeed, nation-ness is the most universally legitimate value in our political time.” ²Anderson argues nationalism for Marxist theory remains an ‘anomaly’. Nationalism is more properly placed in the modern era arising out of the late eighteenth century. Nationalism should not be viewed as an ideology so the use of the big ‘N’ is inappropriate. “It would, I think, make things easier if one treated it as if it belonged with ‘kingship’ and ‘religion’, rather than ‘liberalism’ or fascism.’ ³

Anderson proposes that the “...definition of the nation: it is an imagined political community-and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.”⁴ The citizens of a nation have limited knowledge of each of its fellow citizens. However; ‘...in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.’⁵ Nations are limited because they have boundaries which are confined by the presence of other nations. The concept of nations as sovereign derives from the “...age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm.” ⁶ The

¹ Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*, intro., John E. Towes (Boston:St. Martin's, 1999), 82.

² Benedict R. O'G. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (London; New York, Verso, 2006), 3. <http://o-handle.net.library.lausy.georgetown.edu/2027/heb.01606>(accessed January 16, 2012).

³ Ibid., 5.

⁴ Ibid., 5-6.

⁵ Ibid., 6.

nation imagined as a community exists because its members while recognizing certain inequalities among the population have a deep attachment to their community and to what Anderson describes as a "...horizontal comradeship."⁷

Anderson now moves to explain the sacrifices that comradeship is willing to make. "Ultimately it is this fraternity that makes it possible, over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so to kill, as willingly die for such limited imaginings."⁸ Anderson begins to build his argument by focusing on what he terms fatalities: death and language. The finality of death for human beings can mean the loss of their remembrance-their existence. Anderson attaches to man's desire for lasting memory to the larger memory of the imagined community and therefore the nation wherein its horizontal comradeship erases the fear of being forgotten. He points to the significance of national monuments such as those dedicated to Unknown Soldiers. The remains are unknown but they represent the sacrifice required in creating or maintaining the nation. Nationalism then becomes aligned more closely with religious cultural systems as opposed to the ideologies of Marxism or fascism. Nationalism and Religion explain the fatality of man by creating a narrative whereby human fatality transforms into human continuity.⁹ The perfect vehicle for this transformation is the nation. "If the nation-states are widely conceded to be 'new' and 'historical', the nations to which they

⁶ Ibid.,7.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.,11.

give political expression always loom out of an immemorial past and, still more important, glide into a limitless future.”¹⁰ Anderson explains that to understand nationalism one must forgo attachments to political ideologies but rather align it “... with the large cultural systems that preceded it, out of which-as well as against which –it came into being.”¹¹

As stated earlier, the second fatality was language or more importantly its diversity. When one considers the use of language on a global scale and in the context of the pre-modern era, there were unlimited linguistic possibilities. Overtime certain languages disappeared while others were created. Certainly, there were superior languages in the sense that they were global in nature such as Latin or Arabic but they were limited in their reach. “Particular languages can die or be wiped out, but there was and is no possibility of man’s general linguistic unification.”¹² Anderson does point out that the fragmentation of the Western European political structure did create a paradigm shift resulting in the emergence of vernacular languages in emerging power centers. Linguistic supremacy was achieved by those languages that were aligned with capitalist and print activity resulting in “...monoglot reading publics.”¹³ At this point language

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.,12.

¹² Ibid.,43.

¹³ Ibid.

begins to attach itself the idea of nationalism and nations thus becoming an essential element in understanding its development.

Thus far Anderson has provided that death and language are the two fatalities through which human beings on a global scale seek immortality. Before the breakthrough could occur to ideas of nationalism and nations a fundamental change had to take place with regard to how humanity viewed their sacred script communities, the monarchies that emerged and the "... conception of temporality in which cosmology and history were indistinguishable...."¹⁴ Once achieved, these barriers "...lost their axiomatic grip on men's minds" and the gateway to nationalism had been opened.¹⁵

The challenge then became to change the relationship between mankind and the historical religious cultural systems of Christianity, Islam and the Middle Kingdom. These religions focus on human beings, their place in the universe and the uncertainty of life: illness, suffering and death. Each of these sacred script communities perceived "...themselves to be as cosmically central, through the medium of a sacred language linked to a superterrestrial order of power."¹⁶ This explanation of existence began to lose its primacy with the ascendancy of the period of Enlightenment. This was the age of reason and rationalist thinking-modernity had arrived and with it came nationalism. The fading of religious primacy represents the creative destruction where the ideas from

¹⁴ Ibid., 36.

¹⁵ Ibid., 16.

¹⁶ Ibid.,13.

distant past evolve into ideas of organization that are more current and deal with the immediate.

The commonality of these religious systems was their use of unique languages which at once were limited to a select few and simultaneously transcendent. The use of Latin for religious scholarship and dogma provided a common platform for the Christian community at large to immediately understand the message that was being conveyed. The contents were not attached to a country of origin but rather to an idea on how the world was organized. A gathering of Muslims from different geographic regions could immediately understand each other because the ideas of their faith were conveyed in Arabic. These sacred languages were operating on a global scale allowing Christians and Muslims to envision an attachment to a community beyond the immediate. Knowledge of these sacred languages were confined to an educated elite who “by mediating between vernacular and Latin, mediated between heaven and earth.”¹⁷

These powerful religious cultural systems began losing their power as global communities with the breakout of European exploration into the non-European parts of the world, which “...abruptly widened the cultural and geographical horizon and hence men’s conception of possible forms of human life.”¹⁸ Anderson views these contacts with peoples of differing belief systems as stimulating comparisons between what is discovered as new and what is known to be true or better. He refers to this as a

¹⁷ Ibid., 25.

¹⁸ Ibid., 26.

“...territorialization of faiths” suggesting an early nationalist language.¹⁹ Another factor in the weakening of the religious cultural systems was the decline of the sacred languages. Anderson points out that the primacy of Latin was beginning to fade accelerated in part by the growing print industry producing material in the local vernacular. The fading of Latin was part of a larger process “...in which the sacred communities integrated by old sacred languages were gradually fragmented, pluralized, and territorialized.”²⁰

While the sacred languages provided spiritual guidance, social organization revolved around cultural centers ruled by monarchs operating under the concept of divine right. “Human loyalties were necessarily hierarchical and centripetal because the ruler, like the sacred script, was a node of access to being inherent in it.”²¹ Managing human loyalties meant keeping lines of communication open. While the courtiers might be managing affairs through the high language of Latin, interaction with the local populace required knowledge of the vernacular. Overtime, the vernacular became the operational language of the monarchy creating an identity which could be exploited to maintain control over the immediate area and in some distant lands. The emergence of the United States followed by the French Revolution in 1789 where questioning the “...legitimacy of

¹⁹ Ibid., 17.

²⁰ Ibid., 19.

²¹ Ibid., 36.

the sacral monarchy began its slow decline in Western Europe.”²² Anderson concludes with the observation that this system represented the majority membership in the international political system but by 1914 the concept of sacral monarchy had largely faded away.

The singular event that made it possible to view the sacred communities and dynastic realms differently was the development of a new concept of time. These early cultural systems did not have a concept of history.

Figuring the Virgin Mary with ‘Semitic’ features or ‘first century costumes in the restoring spirit of the modern museum was unimaginable because the medieval Christian mind had no conception of history as an endless chain of causes and effect or of radical separations between past and present.’²³

The leap forward occurred with the shift from a concept of “...empty time...” to a “...transverse cross-time, marked not by prefiguring and fulfillment, but by temporal coincidence and measured by clock and calendar.”²⁴

Anderson explains this concept of trans- versing time through the device of contemporary literature. He targets three works which span the globe. It is not important to go into topical detail about each work but rather to focus on what he is trying to accomplish through the use of this device. These works place the reader in an

²² Ibid., 21.

²³ Ibid., 23.

²⁴ Ibid., 24.

environment that may be situated in some distant locale but the reader can still follow the intimate thoughts of the characters. The reader can follow the intimate journeys of these individuals as they move through time performing the mundane to dealing with serious questions or concerns regarding issues of life and death. The readers can imagine the community that is being described by mentally transporting themselves in the same environment. “Here again we see the ‘national imagination’ at work in the movement of a solitary hero through a sociological landscape of fixity that the world fuses inside the novel with the outside world.”²⁵

We need to return to Anderson’s earlier observation about the development of print technology and its link to the expansive nature of capitalism. He argues that the energy of capitalism required an ever expanding audience to satisfy its need for growth. As has been stated earlier, Latin remained attached to a select few meaning its value to capitalism was limited. Fortuitously, for capitalism, it was Martin Luther’s challenge to the Pope that provided the opportunity for increased production which was targeted to a particular vernacular “...created large new reading publics least among merchants and women who typically knew little or no Latin and simultaneously mobilized them for political-religious purposes.”²⁶ Other opportunities developed in the major dynastic centers which solidified their positions by adopting vernaculars for their particular domains. This construction of languages for particular geographic locations helped in the

²⁵ Ibid., 30.

²⁶ Ibid., 40.

fatality of certain languages by in effect picking winners from the pool of multiple vernaculars. The phenomenon of limiting language and aligning it with geographic locations made possible the imagined communities that Anderson purposes.

Before leaving Anderson it is important to recognize that he points out “... the concrete formation of contemporary nation-states is by no means isomorphic with the determinant reach of print languages.”²⁷ He targets the development of nation states of the America’s as examples where the national print languages were the same as that used by the original colonizers. These new late eighteenth early nineteenth century American states used that common language to create imagined nations that were republics absent of monarchies and class structures. These were the first nation states that created the model for others to follow.

The European experience was different because the struggle for breakout required the monarchies to pick and develop vernacular’s that best suited their cultural experiences and thus a national consciousness. Finally, what Anderson terms the ‘...last wave of nationalisms...’ emanated mostly from colonial Asia and Africa where the unrelenting search for raw materials placed these continents in contact with European forms of social organization. While these groups developed in differing ways the commonality remained: large literate populations, mass printing technology and the unrelenting destructive force of capitalism.

²⁷ Ibid., 46.

Nations as Created

Ernest Gellner remains an important source of scholarly material on the subject of nationalism. His broad body of work has focused on explaining why nationalism is the foundation on which political legitimacy rests. Modern man assumes that the state with its centralized control is the normal political structure. Gellner points out man also can visualize a different circumstance meaning the state contains contingencies.

In fact, nations, like states, are a contingency, not a universal necessity. Neither nations nor states exist at all times and in all circumstances. Moreover, nations and states are not the same contingency. Nationalism holds that they were destined for each other; that either without the other is incomplete, and constitutes a tragedy. But before they become intended for each other, each of them had to emerge, and their emergence was independent and contingent.²⁸

These contingencies are twofold. First, people identify with the same nation when they both recognize and share its culture. Culture in this case defined as readily identifiable signs, symbols and common behavioral and communication processes. Secondly, the inhabitants of nation become a nation only when those inhabitants while being aware of differences commit themselves to mutual rights and therefore see each as equals.

Gellner like Anderson views nationalism as being a modern phenomenon but their respective views on the origin of nationalism are markedly different. Gellner begins with an examination of agrarian society and points to the emergence of literacy as a pivotal moment. Initially, literacy was limited to a select few resulting in a specialized clerical class. Literacy created opportunities in the areas of theology, codification of laws and in the creation of legal agreements. The result of this activity "...the establishment of a

²⁸ Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 2006), 6.

reasonably permanent and standardized script, means in effect the possibility of cultural and cognitive storage and centralization.”²⁹

These activities of cognitive and political centralization operated independent of each other. These literate few in agrarian societies represented a small elite population that was at the top of social organization. Gellner points out this group of elites had various stratifications; clerics, military, and administrators point to a hierarchy within the hierarchy. What was significant about this ruling class was “...there great stress on cultural differentiation rather than on homogeneity.”³⁰ Residing below this stratum were small clusters of people engaged in agricultural activities. These small units tended to operate independent of each and quite probably did not share a common language. Again the idea of social or cultural homogeneity did not exist. Futile attempts to instill homogeneity may have taken place through the clergy promoting shared understanding of the sacraments. “So, for very deep, powerful and insuperable reasons, clerisies in agro-literate societies cannot properly dominate and absorb the entire society.”³¹ There was simply no avenue for cultural cohesiveness.

Cultural cohesiveness appears with industrial society. What drives this change is rationalist thinking. Facts drive knowledge and knowledge is built upon by prior knowledge which in effect creates a continuum of knowledge which Gellner says is “...

²⁹ Ibid., 9.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid., 17.

located within a single continuous logical space... so that in principle one single language describes the world and is internally unitary....”³² This single unifying set of facts drives problem solving to seek efficient solutions resulting in improved productivity within a variety of disciplines. In the final analysis facts produced evidence when aligned with other facts creating outcomes which become decisions. All of which occurs within a homogeneous system of scientific laws subject to constant review resulting in unlimited possibilities for technological advancement and increased social mobility of its inhabitants.

Industrialization changed the nature of work. “It generally involves exchanging communications with other people, or manipulating the controls of a machine.”³³ This situation requires the use of manuals so that all operators of equipment follow standard processes. Specific mass communication of knowledge becomes central to industrial society perpetuating its growth and social mobility. This economic system requires a high level of literacy and technical competence from its society in a standardized form. Gellner argues that the only way to efficiently to create and operate a large standardized educational system is on a national basis. Therefore, given the size and expenditure of supporting such a large physical and employee infrastructure such an enterprise can only be supported by the state. “The monopoly of legitimate education is now more important,

³² Ibid., 21.

³³ Ibid., 32.

more central than is the monopoly of legitimate violence.”³⁴ A sustained broad based national education must now produce ‘... a great high (literate, training-sustained) culture, and it can no longer be a diversified, locally-ties, illiterate little culture or tradition.”³⁵ Gellner has aligned culture with the state.

Gellner states the age of industrialization was at once an age of nationalism and nations. They seem like natural partners to modern man because they operate in unison on a global scale. The transition from old power structures to new ones was at times violent and chaotic. Early, industrialization overwhelmed small social units formerly focused on land based activities to migrate to urban areas. The expanding global economy and the centralized nature of the state were affecting people in new and profound ways. Gellner emphasizes that this expansion what not necessarily driven by military urges but rather the result of superior technology and industrial growth. This expansion reached its apex by 1960 effectively eliminating the pluralistic empires of Europe.

Given nationalism’s apparent juggernaut characteristics Gellner muses that “there is a further important sense in which nationalism remains astonishingly feeble.”³⁶ He argues that if a criterion for culture is language and there exist some 8,000 languages fitted into some 200 nation states then theoretically there exist great potential for more

³⁴ Ibid., 33.

³⁵ Ibid., 37.

³⁶ Ibid., 42.

nationalism. The point for Gellner is that for multiple reasons some cultures coalesce into nations while others do not. “That the principle of nationalism will be operative can be predicted; just which groupings will emerge as its carriers can only be loosely indicated, for it depends on too many historic contingencies.”³⁷

Some of the contingencies that became transformative were the bonding of economic and scientific advancements creating a society increasingly focused on growth and development. Society was becoming increasingly mobile and sophisticated; it was becoming modern. That does not mean that modernity created the nation.

It is nationalism which engenders nations, and not the other way around. Admittedly, nationalism uses the pre-existing, historically inherited proliferation of cultures or cultural wealth, though it uses them very selectively and it most often transforms them radically. Dead languages can be revived, traditions invented, quite fictitious pristine purities restored. But this culturally creative, fanciful, positively inventive aspect of nationalist ardour ought not to allow anyone to conclude, erroneously, that nationalism is a contingent, artificial ideological invention....³⁸

It seems that nationalism at once emerges to protect a particular culture while at the same time aggressively deconstructs that culture and purposively selects certain attributes to invent a new cultural narrative.

One predictor of nationalism remains the emergence of a high culture which is defined by high literacy rates, standardized educational practices communicated on a large scale. High culture is the social structure of modern society and its benefits are

³⁷ Ibid., 45

³⁸ Ibid., 54-55.

shared or at least perceived to be shared equally. As stated earlier from this achievement emerges nations which are required to sustain the high infrastructure costs associated with large educational systems. Gellner sees the movement of selections and inventions within nationalism as:

...the general imposition of a high culture on society, where previously low cultures had taken up lives of the majority, and in some cases the totality, of the population. It means the general diffusion of a school-mediated, academy-supervised idiom, codified for the requirements of a reasonably precise bureaucratic and technological communication. It is the establishment of an anonymous impersonal society, with mutually substitutable atomized individuals held together above all by a shared culture of this kind, in place of the previous complex structure of local groups, sustained by folk cultures reproduced locally and idiosyncratically by the micro-groups themselves.³⁹

Nationalism seeks out those narratives from low cultures reworks them and uses them in new narratives. The elevation of high culture as the structural basis of modern society becomes self-perpetuating through celebrations of itself designed to affirm its legitimacy. The result for Gellner was the emergence of a "...new form of social organization, that is based on deeply internalized, education- dependent high cultures each protected by its own state."⁴⁰

Gellner seems to be saying that nations do have a connection to the past and that like a planet created from a cosmic explosion in deep space nations emerged from the industrialization process. The difficulty in accepting this theory remains how he views history. The reference to nations sifting through their history and selecting what seems

³⁹ Ibid., 56.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 46.

appropriate seems to indicate that history is important to nations on the other hand the history of nations seems to begin with the transition to modernity and all that it represents.

In an effort for others to more fully understand the complexity of nationalism, Gellner created a typology of situations that either produce or inhibit nationalism. For this work it is not necessary to comment on the complete content of his matrix but a general discussion might be helpful in with regard to the topic of this paper. What is clear is that nationalism emerges only when cultural differences are present. Also, either the ruling class or the ruled must have access to state sponsored educational systems for nationalism to occur. The difficulty lies in selecting the typology that most resembles the Cypriot situation. Ethnic nationalism as described by Gellner contains power holders who have access to 'high culture' but it is unique to their ethnicity. The less fortunate [literate] are represented by a literate elite striving to transform their 'low' culture into a high culture. Gellner associates this typology most closely with the nationalisms located in Eastern Europe.⁴¹

Diaspora nationalism, he refers to as 'middle-man' nationalism. This situation is mostly to occur in societies in transition to a higher level of productive modes. These individuals would have performed some function that gave them access to incumbent power holders and hence they are strongly positioned to succeed in the new culture. They

⁴¹ Ibid., 101.

are however ethnically distinct, lacking in political power and at risk for violence.

Gellner identifies Greeks among others that fit into this category.⁴²

Since nationalism and nations are the result of modernist ‘high cultures’ ethnicity would not seem to be an element in state formation. The earliest national formation that emerged in the United States was not driven by a specific ethnic group but rather by a well- educated elite, Gellner’s ‘high culture’. Later nationalism would emerge in Britain around multiple ethnic groups blending themselves into the common Englishmen. So “...ethnicity enters the political sphere as nationalism when cultural homogeneity or continuity is required by the economic base of social life and when, consequently, culture linked class differences become noxious, while ethnically unmarked, gradual class differences remain tolerable.”⁴³

Class differences become intolerable when ethnicity serves to separate and therefore restrict access and create differences in the quality of opportunities made available. This is most likely to occur in the early stages of industrial development when one ethnic group tries to dominate the others. The result can be that the targeted group organizes itself around its particular ethnicity. Restricting entrance into educational institutions which is critical to success in ‘high culture’ could be a point of tension. Tensions among ethnic groups will rise leading to violence particularly when the targeted ethnic group becomes blocked from movement across lines of social stratification.

⁴² Ibid.,101-109.

⁴³ Ibid., 90.

Roadblocks in upward social movement due to ethnic identity, exclusive media control of culture identifications, denial of access to capital or the seizing of property provide the fuel for national disintegration and nationalist conflicts.

Before leaving Gellner and moving towards a hybrid theorem of nationalism that maybe appropriate to the level of analysis required in this particular work, it might be helpful to summarize what has been discussed with regard to Gellner. Gellner aligns nationalism with modernity. His theorem takes a long historical view. Gellner does not reach into the historical past for the development of his ideas. He argues that they have no relevance because the historical past is vastly different than the modern era.

The pre-agrarian period comprised of small illiterate hunter gatherer social organizations. The agrarian period focused on the production of food organized into tribes, villages, city states or dynastic realms with religious traditions. Agrarian society did contain literate elite but these social organizations were typically geographically limited and did not necessarily require a political structure operating on a national level.

Finally, the industrial age, which saw the convergence of technological innovations, scientific analysis and capitalism creating the modern economy and the 'high culture' required to operate a modern state.

So the economy needs both the new type of central culture and the central state; the culture needs the state; and the state probably needs the homogenous cultural branding of its flock....In brief, the mutual relationship of a modern culture and state is something quite new, and springs, inevitably from the requirements of a modern economy.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ Ibid., 134.

Since state development required the presence of a ‘high culture’, education was the critical component in developing the skilled labor required to support the growth that a modern capitalist society required. This is where ideas of nationalism emerged leading to political structures that became nations. Remember that Gellner maintained that nationalism brings nations into existence. Nationalism required the creation of a narrative that needed to be communicated on a mass scale. Gellner characterized the development of this new society as ‘impersonal and anonymous’ in which all its inhabitants were ‘substitutable.’⁴⁵ The effect of all this activity was the creation of a modern culture that became the organizing social structure mutually accepted by all.

While Gellner writes authoritatively on the topic of nations and nationalism he does acknowledge that is not possible to identify which cultures will be successful in creating the nationalist narrative and ‘high culture’ to achieve nationhood. In fact he states that there exists a fragility associated with nationalism. All societal groups may be capable of moving into the ranks of nations. Nationalism maybe a very strong force in operation today but the creation of nations which is the objective of nationalism occurs unevenly and is not predictable.

Conclusion

On the one hand nationalism is imagined because it reaches back to the past and finds cultural artifacts such as religion and dynastic realms that can be reworked and be meaningful in the modern era. Nationalism begins to appear as a result of the fatality of

⁴⁵ Ibid., 56.

languages due to the expansion of print technology driven by capitalism need to increase its markets. On the other hand nationalism emerges from a particular set of circumstances that begin to be visible in the middle of the eighteenth century and not connected to the past. Nationalism in this case supplants the low cultures of the past with a 'high culture' that operates in an environment of industrialization, technology, mass communication and a broad based educational system open to all. It is clear that nationalism is linked to modernity.

It is also clear that the emergence of nationalism did not initially appear in the large cultural centers of Europe but rather in the offshore outposts of North and South America. These early explorations created the awareness of other cultures resulting in comparisons, definitions and categorization. The paradox for those early European explorers was that once they had settled in their new lands, the power structures in their countries of origin viewed them differently. They became the elites in the new world but their status stopped at the water's edge. Their countries of origin perceived them to be something other and therefore not part of society's elite power structure. This reality forced those early European explorers to create a narrative unique to their situation, thus setting the foundation for ideas of nationalism separate from their countries of origin. This was the genesis of nationalism and nations reacted to their 'otherness's' by creating their own narrative resulting in a culture and nations separate from their origin. Later, with industrialization, Europe began to transform itself into modern secular state systems

through the creation of shared cultures attached to specific geographic locations. The transformation was uneven and at times violent but has largely been achieved.

As stated in the opening paragraph of this chapter the objective was to create a conceptualization of nationalism and nations that could be used in the examination of the government model for the first Cypriot Republic. The operational theorem will contain the following elements:

1. Nationalism and nations have links to a specific historical past.
2. Nationalism needs the presence of other cultures so that comparisons, definitions, and categorization occur to craft its unique narrative.
3. Nations will only emerge when society moves beyond its local perspective and coalesces around a shared inclusive cultural narrative. That transition ultimately results in the development of a unified political system.
4. This phenomenon resides in modernity defined as an historical period identified with a sophisticated culture that relies on large standardized educational systems, technology, science and intricate financial systems.
5. Understanding the seeds necessary for its emergence will not result in predicting the locations where nationalism and nations might appear.

This will be the theorem used going forward when evaluating the chapter on the government model of the first Cypriot Republic and later in the chapter concerning the international actors involved in its construction.

CHAPTER TWO

CYPRUS: A CREATED STATE CONTAINING TWO NATIONS

The first Cypriot Republic came into existence August 16, 1960. By December 1963, the sovereign state of Cyprus had devolved into ethnic discord ultimately partitioning Cyprus into two ethnically distinct enclaves. This chapter will concern itself with that failure through an examination of selected proposals and their alignment with our theorem on nationalism. Initial efforts focused on the creation of a political structure of limited government but not independence. Ultimately the failure of those early proposals evolved into the creation of a free and independent sovereign state. Proposals to be examined include the Radcliffe Proposals and Macmillan Proposals and finally the end state being the 1960 Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus. The constitution identified two distinct political entities based upon by their ethnicity: Greek or Turkish. The separation of political power by ethnicity on Cyprus forced both sides to identify with either Greece or Turkey and cut off any hope of national unity. Validation of this statement will become apparent through examination of the above referenced documents when measured against the political theorem developed in the previous chapter.

The Radcliffe Proposals

In July, 1956 the British government appointed Lord Cyril Radcliffe British Constitutional Commissioner, with the task of framing a constitution for the island of Cyprus. The Radcliffe Proposals merit analysis because in some limited ways they attempt to overcome the ethnic discord through the creation of a political process that both groups could operate within. The proposals include ideas about standardized

education, technical schools, English as a common language and mass communication: necessary components for the development of nationalism. First, it is important to place the Radcliffe efforts in their proper context by presenting the parameters that the British government had established:

- a. that during the period of the Constitution Cyprus is to remain under British sovereignty;
- b. ...Cyprus as a base is necessary for the fulfillment of Her Majesty's Government of their international obligations and for the defence of British interests in the Middle East and the interests of other Powers allied or associated with the United Kingdom;
- c. that all matters relating to external affairs, defence and internal security are retained in the hands of Her Majesty's Government or the Governor;
- d. a liberal democracy and is to confer a wide measure of responsible self-government on elected representatives of the people of Cyprus, but is at the same time to contain such reservations, provisions and guarantees as may be necessary to give a just protection to the special interests of the various communities, religions and races in the island.¹

Radcliffe's portfolio was to create a Cypriot constitutional government anchored in the ideals of a liberal democracy, which was meant to provide some form of limited but shared internal governance therefore increasing internal stability, individual safety and finally individual freedom. All of this was to operate within the boundaries of the British Commonwealth and therefore to remain under British sovereignty. There was no pathway to change the international status of Cyprus. Therefore, the intent of the Radcliff model

¹ Lord Cyril Radcliffe, *Constitutional Proposals for Cyprus* (London;H.M.S.O., 1956), 6; www.limcdigital.org/georgetown.edu/docdisplay.aspx?testid+4369708%type=PDF(accessed January 16, 2012).

of governance was primarily to serve the interests of Britain by maintaining the status quo with Greece and Turkey while simultaneously creating a state of equilibrium between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities.

The immediate challenge in achieving a state of equilibrium between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities was overcoming the mistrust between the two communities. Radcliffe observed:

Whatever the truth of the matter, I have no doubt at all that the circumstances of the last 18 months and the pressure of the Greek Cypriot campaign for Enosis have done much to sharpen the sense of alienation between the two communities, and I think that any plan for the future must accept the fact of this alienation as present now and in the future.²

The Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities lived side by side but essentially remained separate from each other. This was at the root of the problem that Radcliff faced in trying to create some form of a stable democratic government. Limited shared sovereignty becomes a difficult concept when language, religion, cultural preferences, and separate ethnic communities exist within towns and villages.

This communal separation had motivated the minority Turkish Cypriot community to request political representation equal to that of the Greek Cypriot community.³ Radcliff was cognizant of the possibility of the majority Greek Cypriot community ignoring the legitimate requests of the minority Turkish Cypriot community.

² Ibid., 12.

³ Ibid., 13.

However, the idea of equal political representation for each community was rejected by Radcliffe because he felt that that form of political representation was more suitable to a federal system. “There is no pattern of territorial separation between the two communities and apart from other objections, federation of communities which does not involve also federation of territories seems to me a very difficult constitutional form.”⁴ Radcliffe’s philosophical approach was to move towards the creation of a system of good governance versus focusing on “... separate identification of different interests.”⁵

One of the essential elements embedded in our theorem of nationalism requires the presence of another culture. Differences are identified resulting in the creation of distinctions setting the stage for the creation of a unique narrative that in certain circumstances can transcend ethnic differences and thus permit the coalescing of society. Self-governance if it was to be achieved required among other things a unified narrative of what it meant to be a Cypriot. Radcliffe seemed to be targeting the issue of good governance in the hopes that during the process of its construction a unified body politic would emerge. Perhaps he realized that each ethnic group had attachments to separate historical pasts which could not be woven into a single narrative.

Given the Cypriot people had no tradition of self-governance Radcliffe concluded as follows:

It seems to me only fair to all those who may be concerned in carrying out the experiment that they should be presented at the outset with as clear as picture as pencil can draw of the range and limits of their respective functions, rather than

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

that the frontiers should be left to be defined by trial and error or constitutional convention. For I fear that under the stress of such day- to- day exploration the constitution itself might begin to crack.⁶

Radcliffe proposed a constitution which he described as a diarchy wherein power is shared but certain powers are reserved for a particular branch of the government. In this case, Cyprus would be governed by a Royal Governor and Commander in Chief assigned by Her Majesty's commission. A Legislative Assembly comprised of Greek and Turkish Cypriots would be elected. "There will thus be two systems of law- making existing side by side but separated according to difference of the subject with which they deal."⁷ In general terms the Royal Governor would be responsible for Cypriot external affairs, defense, and internal security and the Legislative Assembly focused the on the development of laws required for the day-to- day operations of the country.

The retained powers of the Royal Governor are extensive and to fully elaborate on them is not necessary for the purpose of this analysis. However, a general outline of his authority would provide a sense of the span of control that the Royal Governor exercised. The Royal Governor by law selected a Chief Minister who would serve as Head of State for all matters that fall within the realm of self-governing matters. The basic responsibilities will follow in the discussion of the Legislative Assembly. The Governor would also appoint a Minister of Turkish Cypriot Affairs who had been elected from registrants on the Turkish Cypriot voter rolls.

⁶ Ibid., 7.

⁷ Ibid., 8.

The Chief Minister would be selected from the Legislative Assembly and generally be viewed as an individual who possessed a broad range of support from said group. Reporting to the Chief Minister would be the Ministries of Development, Interior and Local Government, Finance, Communications and Works, Social Services and Natural Resources. In order to keep the British Governor and the Legislative Assembly informed as to what activities or initiatives may be taking place in the respective ministries; a consultative body was to be created known as the Joint Council of Cyprus. Membership as envisioned by Radcliff would include the Governor, Deputy Governor, Chief Minister and another Minister nominated by him, Minister of Turkish Cypriot Affairs, a representative of the Defense forces, Legal Secretary and Attorney -General.⁸

Radcliff did feel that a political structure could be created that protected minority rights. First and foremost was a commitment that all legislative acts would not discriminate against any citizen with regard to their religion, cultural preferences or language. The Legislative Assembly would be comprised of thirty- six members: twenty- four members elected from the general electoral roles, six Turkish members elected from the Turkish electoral roles and six others appointed by the Royal Governor.⁹ Any legislation that alters existing Assembly legislation can only be adopted when accepted by two thirds of the Turkish Assembly members. This “double majority” requirement seems at odds with the concept of self-governance when the minority can in effect veto legislation that it opposes. Protection of rights and settlement of inter-communal

⁸ Ibid.,10.

⁹ Ibid.

differences would be the responsibility of the Supreme Court. Court composition would contain an equal number of Greek and Turkish Cypriots and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court would be appointed and not be a citizen of Cyprus. Administration of Turkish Cypriot interests would fall under the Office of Turkish Administrative Affairs who would be appointed by the Governor.

Radcliffe's pattern of ethnic separateness with regard to the structure of self-governance ends with the issues of broadcasting and education. He recognized the importance of an independent mass communication system and states that its control should reside with the citizens of Cyprus. So that dissemination of information would be fairly balanced and serve the interests of the different communities, he proposed the creation of a public charter for broadcasting similar to the B.B.C. Radcliffe viewed an independent broadcasting system free of manipulation as an essential protection of minority rights. He envisioned a board of directors equally represented by Greek and Turkish Cypriots while being directed by an independent chairman.

Regarding education, Radcliffe does not attempt to alter the then current practice of each ethnic group operating separate schools systems. These schools operated with different curriculum and lack standardization. He recognized the importance of constructing a system of inter-communal education but was uncertain of its place in the proposed constitution. He proposed the development of inter-communal secondary and technical schools that are available to all citizens but not mandatory. He reflected:

But the inter-communal system and all its intangible advantages arising from the mixing of the children of the different communities at the formative years of education provide a valuable supplement to the other separate systems of

education. Taking a reasonably long view, such a means of education provides, as I see it, one of the most helpful paths toward a mitigation of the racial separations which are at the bottom of the Cyprus problem. And it is a path which no one is compelled to take. ¹⁰

Radcliffe's ideas regarding broadcasting and education coincide with the operating theorem regarding nationalism and nations. He understood the importance of mass communication and state developed standardized educational systems. These are essential elements present in modern society.

One could argue that the Radcliffe Proposals should not be included in this analysis because his purpose was not to create a state but simply to create some form of limited self-government. The argument has merit but the purpose of this examination was to determine how Radcliffe's proposals aligned with the hybrid nationalist theorem developed for this thesis. In that regard Radcliffe falls short on many counts:

- a. the creation of an office of Turkish Cypriot Affairs
- b. the assignment of legislative assembly seats along ethnic lines
- c. the double majority effect by requiring two-thirds majority with in the Turkish assembly members
- d. a constitution of such rigidity and that any change in the powers of the Legislative Assembly are reserved for the Queen
- e. the linkage of Cypriot sovereignty to British security interests

In the end the Greek Cypriots rejected his proposal because it did not address independence while the Turkish Cypriots expressed interest in further discussions.

Radcliffe's efforts failed.

¹⁰ Ibid., 20.

However, when one views his work in comparison to what follows Radcliffe comes remarkably close to creating an environment where ideas of nationalism might emerge. He waffles on majority rule but nonetheless understands its being the foundation of liberal democratic rule. He attempted to bridge the gap of mistrust between the two ethnic groups by encouraging a state sponsored inter-communal educational system with a standardized curriculum. He insisted on the creation of a broadcasting system free of political influence, providing a platform for the free and open exchange of ideas from the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities. Given that the Cypriots lacked a history of political organization the proposals that he put forward do contain some seeds that if properly cultivated that may have resulted in a unified Cyprus but as our theorem states predicting the location of the emergence of nationalism remains a tricky proposition.

Macmillan Proposals

Macmillan's proposals lack the depth of detail contained in the Radcliffe's proposals. Macmillan's proposals support the concept of separate communities which close off or reduce the possibility of developing a unique cultural narrative. Yet at the same time they do not rule out the possibility of a change in the international status of Cyprus. Also, Macmillan may have recognized that the Greek campaign for unity with Greece in part pointed to an identity crisis for the Greek Cypriots. The Greek Cypriot campaign for unity with Greece was spreading beyond simply targeting British interests to include Turkish Cypriots creating tensions between NATO members Greece and Turkey. Macmillan put forward a new plan which contained four objectives:

- a. to serve the best interests of all the people island;

- b. to achieve a permanent settlement acceptable to the two communities in the Island and the Greek and Turkish Governments;
- c. to safeguard the British bases and installations in the Island, which are necessary to enable the United Kingdom to carry out her international obligations;
- d. to strengthen peace and security, and co-operation between the United Kingdom and her Allies, in a vital area.¹¹

He continued to link Cypriot sovereignty to British military interests. The introduction of Greece and Turkey into the governing structure was at once an attempt to mitigate Cypriot communal violence and reduce Greek-Turkish tensions.

The rationale for the inclusion of Greece and Turkey into the political affairs of Cyprus was stated in the plan:

In order to satisfy the desire of the Greek and Turkish Cypriots to be recognized as Greeks and Turks, Her Majesty's Government will welcome an arrangement which gives them Greek or Turkish nationality, while enabling them to retain British nationality.¹²

In effect, Macmillan was enabling the inhabitants of Cypriots to pick a nationality beyond their shores. The British Ambassador to the United States wrote in part in a letter to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles regarding the offer of dual nationality: "If Greece agrees, the Greeks in Cyprus will enjoy Greek nationality while retaining British nationality. Thus they will be able to satisfy their desire to be recognized as Greeks without

¹¹ United States Department of State, Glenn W. LaFantaise, gen. ed., *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1958-1960, Vol. 10, Part 1, Eastern Europe Regions; Soviet Union: Cyprus* (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1993) ,doc. 206, 619.

¹² *Ibid.*, 620.

giving up advantages from which they now benefit.”¹³ These two statements clearly suppress the development of a Cypriot nationality which could have served a point of commonality and enabled the alignment of Cypriots towards either Greek or Turkish nationalities.

Unlike Radcliffe who recommended a single legislative assembly, Macmillan proposed that each ethnic community have its own House of Representatives. Cyprus would be ruled by a British Colonial Governor who would preside over a governing Council comprised of representatives of the Greek and Turkish governments. Other members would be selected from each House of Representatives: four Greek and two Turkish. The Governor would focus on external affairs, defense of Cyprus and internal security. Since the internal administration resides with the Council, the governments of Greece and Turkey have the right to demand arbitration by an impartial body any legislation they feel limits or discriminates against a particular ethnic group. MacMillan’s plan concludes with the following statement:

...Her Majesty’s Government would be prepared, at the appropriate time, to go further and, subject to the reservation to the United Kingdom of such bases and facilities as might be necessary for the discharge of her international obligations, to share sovereignty of the Island with their Greek and Turkish allies as their contribution for a lasting settlement.¹⁴

The proposed political structure of the Macmillan Proposal accentuates the divisions of the Cypriot community by defining people in terms of their nationality and then allowing the Greek and Turkish governments create the narrative for each community.

¹³ Ibid., 618.

¹⁴ Ibid., 621.

In fact Macmillan's plan for Cyprus has been interpreted as follows:

The guise of partition was inherent in all these provisions, acknowledged even by Macmillan who described it a "metaphysical partition", and the Colonial Office called it "pre-partition". It was not so much that the constitution, in trying to protect the demographic minority (Turkish Cypriots) from the potential tyranny of the majority (Greek Cypriots) in doing away with majority rule since a 20% minority would equally share power with a 78% majority.¹⁵

Whether the above statement truly reflects Macmillan's objective remains unclear, a counter argument could be made that Macmillan had two objectives one of which was to retain control over Cyprus and create British sovereign areas for British bases. What is certain is that this plan works against creating common points of understanding by constructing a political structure that focuses on ethnic differences. The Macmillan Proposals arguably fail to meet the prescribed nationalist theorem. The plan was rejected by Greece because it was perceived to favor partition and mildly embraced by Turkey. The result was a stalemate that opened the door for Greece and Turkey to hold direct talks in an effort to craft a solution.

1960 Cypriot Constitution: Separate but Equal

In 1959 the London and Zurich Agreements were signed by Britain, Greece and Turkey. The agreements contained among others a document titled the Basic Structure Agreement, which essentially became the framework for the Cypriot constitution. Three treaties are included which provides for British bases as sovereign territory, allows for the stationing of Greek and Turkish troops on the island and finally guarantees the right of

¹⁵ Andrekos Varnava, "Reinterpreting Macmillan's Cyprus Policy, 1957-1960" *The Cypriot Review*, 22, no.1 (Spring 2010): 92, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/74880911> (accessed October 1, 2012).

the signatories [Britain, Greece or Turkey] to unilaterally intervene in Cyprus in order to preserve the state of affairs established in the agreement. The agreements surprisingly coincide with past British policy of treating the Greek and Cypriot communities as separate political entities.

When viewed through the lens of our theorem on nationalism the agreements lack any elements necessary for the development of nationalist feelings. Principally, the concept of separation by ethnicity within the constitution [irrevocable as outlined in the Basic Structure Agreement] virtually guaranteed no avenue for reconciliation or the development of a unique Cypriot national narrative. In fact there are no provisions which enable joint activities between the two communities in the arts, education, athletics, or labor movements. This remains the essential reason for the failure of the constitution for the first Cypriot Republic. That said the concepts put forward at that time and place are worthy examination because ethnic reconciliation remains as difficult today as it was in 1960.

The Cypriot constitution institutionalizes through law two separate political communities: Greek or Turkish. Article II identifies Greek being defined as a person whose mother tongue is Greek or who belongs to the Greek Orthodox Church. Turkish being defined as persons whose mother tongue is Turkish and are Muslim.¹⁶ Consequently Cyprus has two official languages. All citizens were required to select a community. Since there were a number of other religious groups on the island the

¹⁶ *World Constitutions Illustrated*, Draft Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus 1960, (1993),1:<http://0-www.heinonline.org.gull.georgetown.edu> (accessed October 12, 2012).

constitution provides that such religious groups must decide to which of the two communities they chose to associate. Religious group size must exceed 1000 of which 500 are Cypriot citizens and their decision must be presented to the appropriate community within a specified time. Ethnic groups such as the Armenians and the Maronites in effect are forced to opt out of their then current religious group affiliation and join one of the two state recognized political groups.¹⁷ Failure to legally recognize the presence of other ethnicities prohibits the possibility of comparisons, definitions and categorization to craft a unique nationalist narrative.

Hence the constitution which only identifies two political entities does not allow for the possibility of a multi-cultural Cypriot society. The political structure also effectively suppressed any pathway to the development of a common cultural narrative that could result into a Cypriot nationality. Perhaps more importantly, the dual nature of constitutional power severely limited the Greek Cypriots a method of assimilating the Turks into one political system thus creating a new definition of Greekness.¹⁸ It is hard to view this concept of democracy as liberal.

Article I of the constitution states: “Cyprus is an independent and sovereign Republic with a presidential regime, the President being Greek and the Vice-President being Turk elected by the Greek and Turkish Communities respectively as hereinafter in

¹⁷ Ibid., 2.

¹⁸ Adamantia Pollis, “Intergroup Conflict and British Colonial Policy: The Case of Cyprus”, *Comparative Politics*, 5, no.4 (July 1973):593, [http://www.jstor.org/stable 421397](http://www.jstor.org/stable/421397) (accessed January 27, 2009).

this Constitution provided.”¹⁹ Each is elected separately by Greek or Turkish citizens registered on separate electoral lists. This pattern of elections through ethnic separation flows through the entire political system. The separation of power by ethnicity works against the concept of a unified political system as evidenced by the veto power that the President and Vice-President are invested with. Article 50 makes clear that this power extends to a broad range of laws or decisions that emerge from the House of Representatives including but not limited to foreign affairs.²⁰ Succession laws require that the President’s [Greek] office be filled by President of the House of Representatives [Greek] and the Vice-President [Turkish] by the Vice-President of the House of Representatives [Turkish].

The Cypriot constitution contains twenty-four articles outlining the structure and authority of the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives contained fifty members each elected by their respective communities. Article 62 specifies that seventy percent of the members shall be Greek and thirty percent shall be Turkish. The Greek representatives elect the President of the House of Representatives similarly the Turkish House members elect the Vice-President. Article 73 section eight requires that all speeches and legislative activity being conducted be immediately translated into the other official language.²¹ The nationalist theorem does not contain language as an essential element but given that English was prevalent on the island, it seems that there existed an

¹⁹ Draft Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus, 1960,1.

²⁰ Ibid., 23.

²¹ Ibid., 33.

opportunity to converse politically at least in a common language which may in part have helped to mitigated the cultural differences. Article 78 of the constitution highlights the paradox of the entire project by at once stating that all laws and decisions in the House can pass by a simple majority but any legislation dealing with electoral law, taxes or municipalities requires a majority vote from both the Greek and Turkish House of Representatives.²² Democracies operate under the concept of majority rule but in this case that concept becomes a moot point since certain legislation requires separate majority votes from the Greek and Turkish members of the House of Representatives. Separate political power centers equates to a limiting and dissolution of legislative power and effectiveness.

Constitutionally sanctioned representation by ethnicity extends beyond the executive and legislative branches. The Supreme Constitutional Court was comprised of a three judge panel one Greek, one Turks both citizens of the Republic of Cyprus. The third judge would not be a citizen of Cyprus, Britain, Greece or Turkey and serve as the President of the Court. The Courts jurisdictional control included deciding issues of authority within the legislative branch and between the legislative branch and the executive branch. The Supreme Constitutional Court was specifically responsible for settling matters which dealt with perceived discriminatory legislation. While the constitution specified in great detail on a wide range of matters it remains silent on the definition of discrimination.

²² Ibid., 34.

No criteria as to what constitutes discrimination are indicated, but they are obviously to be derived and without beyond the constitution. The underlying premise seems to be that the conflict of interest between the two communities transcends, and will and should continue to transcend, any common loyalty to the state; hence it necessitates standards of judgment other than those provided for in the Constitution.²³

Lacking a common loyalty to the state precludes society for coalescing around shared cultural ideas about what is discriminatory and tethers each ethnic group to their local values precluding the emergence of nationalism.

Operating beneath the Supreme Constitutional Court was the High Court. Article 153 stipulated that the court will be comprised of four judges: two Greek, one Turk and one neutral judge similarly separate in nationality as the Supreme Constitutional Court.²⁴

The neutral judge serves as President of the Court and has two votes. All judges were appointed through joint agreement by the President and Vice-President of the Republic. Generally, lower courts operate as self-contained units meaning the judges were members of the same ethnic community as the defendant or plaintiff. In the event of cross ethnic civil or criminal cases Article 155 stated that the High Court had the responsibility of determining the composition of the court meaning the selection of judges from each community.²⁵

This dual administration of the law negates the very notion and feasibility of the impartial application of the law, and presumes that a judge conceives of himself first as Greek or Turk, only secondarily as a judge. Comparable provisions on composition, appointive powers, and so on, govern the Public Service

²³ Pollis, "Intergroup Conflict and British Colonial Policy: The Case of Cyprus," 595.

²⁴ Draft Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus, 1960, 61.

²⁵ Ibid., 63.

Commission, public service employees, the police and gendarmerie.²⁶

This unique judicial structure negates the concept of justice being blind and therefore does not permit society to move beyond its local perspective which is necessary to the development of a nationalist narrative.

Thus far the discussion has focused on those powers which operate at the national level. A separation was crafted between government operating at the national level and government operating at the local level. Article 61 states: “The legislative power of the Republic is exercised by the House of Representatives in all domains with the exception of those which are explicitly reserved for the Communal Chambers.”²⁷ Members of the Greek and Turkish political communities each elect members from their respective communities. The Communal Chambers are the center of power in the first Cypriot Republic. Consider some of the contents of point 1 of Article 87:

1. The Communal Chambers shall, in relation to their respective community, have competence to exercise within limits of this constitution...legislative power solely with regard to the following matters:
 - a. all religious matters;
 - b. all educational, cultural and teaching matters;
 - c. personal status;
 - d. the composition and instances of courts dealing with civil disputes relating to personal status and to religious matters;

²⁶ Pollis, “Intergroup Conflict and British Colonial Policy: The Case of Cyprus,” 595.

²⁷ Draft Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus, 1969, 28.

e. imposition of personal taxes and fees on members of their respective communities in order to provide for respective needs and for the needs of bodies and institutions under their control as in Article 88 provided.²⁸

The authorities listed above point to two self-contained political structures each independent of the national political structure. The Communal Chambers have the constitutional authority to receive subsidies from Greece and Turkey. The most troubling aspect of this constitutionally sponsored communal separation involves the dual educational systems that were constructed. As stated in the nationalist theorem a standardized state sponsored educational system is an essential component to nationalism and nations.

There was in fact no possibility for the development a standardized educational system. The constitution provided that in the event of an insufficient number of teachers were not available within the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities it was acceptable to hire qualified Greek or Turkish nationals to fill vacant positions. Separate educational systems directed by individuals of Greek and Turkish heritage simply wash out the concept of being a Cypriot. Consider the following observation from 1973:

The curriculum of the Greek schools, taught in Greek of course, extols Greek national history and “proves” the Greekness of Cyprus, while the curriculum in the Turkish schools is similarly structured in terms of Turkish nationalism. The Turkish Cypriots seem in fact to have retained a greater measure of control over their curricula than have the Greek Cypriots, since the Turkish Cypriot textbooks still put forward the concept of Turkish nationalism as put forward by Kemal Ataturk and not adopted modifications in later Turkish textbooks. By contrast the Greek Ministry of Education recently to Cyprus, over the opposition the of

²⁸ Ibid., 36.

President Makarios, textbooks for classroom use that attack President Makarios on the grounds that he is betraying the Greek cause and Greece.²⁹

The rigid educational system as devised by members of the Greek and Turkish governments may have been created to preserve the identity of their respective communities but it failed to develop a shared culture.

The theorem as stated requires that state sponsored educational institutions be established to promote a shared culture which is an essential element to sustaining social cohesion. A unified state sponsored educational system provides society with literate individuals capable of adding value to modern society but more importantly a unified educational system provides guidance on understanding cultural identifications which in turn can lead to ideas about nationalism. Unfortunately these dual state sponsored educational systems operated on a limited scale by encouraging loyalty to the states of Greece and Turkey instead of creating a broad based system of multicultural units.

Before moving to concluding remarks for this chapter it would be helpful to briefly recap the constitutional arrangement devised in Zurich by representatives of the governments of Greek and Turkey. The constitution does recognize the essential democratic values of individual rights, majority rule and free and open elections. It contains the executive, legislative, and judicial institutions present in modern democracies. The court system guarantees civil rights and prosecution of criminal activity. The constitution contains some one-hundred and eight seven articles many of

²⁹ Pollis, "Intergroup Conflict and British Colonial Policy: The Case Of Cyprus," 596.

which seem extraneous to governance. The topics covered among others included a formula for community broadcasting times, marriage, divorce, miscellaneous public laws and candidate qualifications. The powerful and separate of the Communal Chambers independent of the national government, the veto powers of the Vice-President and the double majority vote in the House of Representatives make it hard to recognize this as liberal democratic system.

Final Thoughts

What does it mean to be a Cypriot? That seems to be the essential question when planning the development of Cyprus. However that question was never asked of Lord Radcliffe. Rather his charge was to provide a system of limited self-governance with the prospect of Cypriot sovereignty. In that regard he envisioned a unified system of governance through the creation of a Legislative Assembly comprised of a certain number of Greek and Turkish Cypriots. While he set aside six assembly seats for Turkish Cypriots the remaining twenty-four seats were chosen from the general electoral rolls providing for essentially an open and free election. In the cover letter of his proposals he stated that he was faced with two problems the second of which relates to protection of minorities:

The other is how is, how to impose such restrictions on the local Legislature as to secure effective protection-protection “with teeth”-for the minorities of the Island. When I use the word “minorities” I do not at all forget that the minorities are themselves racial communities, which possess through varying degrees, historical traditions and religious, cultural and social bonds different from the majority race in Cyprus, the Greek Cypriot.³⁰

³⁰ Lord Cyril Radcliffe, *Constitutional Proposals for Cyprus*, 7.

Clearly the intent for Radcliffe was to come as close as possible to a liberal democracy. The inclusion of all cultures in the governing process allowed for the categorization of differences which when properly understood by all parties could allow that society to transcend those differences and create a common narrative. He desire for a common educational system allowed for the potential of students to share in some limited way a shared cultural experience. These were the seeds of nationalism that if allowed to germinate might have produced a nationalist narrative. However, the diminution of majority rule with the double majority clause for the Turkish Cypriots begins the process of partition of the communities. With regard to the theorem on nationalism Radcliffe's proposals do not meet the standard but he does seem to see Cypriots albeit as Greek and Turkish but nonetheless Cypriots.

Macmillan's Proposals clearly look beyond a Cypriot identity and move towards two separate and distinct ethnic groups. He was in fact moving in several directions simultaneously. Britain security interests no longer required the full use of the Island but rather specific areas that would remain the sovereign territory of Britain. The Greek guerilla movement [EKOA] for union with Greece was becoming increasingly violent and spilling over into the Turkish Cypriot community. Consequently, the tension in Cyprus increasingly involved the governments of Greece and Turkey stressing the NATO alliance. The people of Cyprus reside at the bottom of Macmillan's priorities. His solution involved partnering with the governments of Greece and Turkey for the administration of Cyprus. Cyprus remained under the control of Britain but Greece and

Turkey would participate in decisions involving the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities.

The possibility of a Cypriot identity gets submerged under the weight of the presence of Greek and Turkish nationals imposing their unique ideas of nationalism on their respective communities. Under the Macmillan Proposals the Cypriot communities must attach themselves to the histories and narratives of other nations. Granted Cyprus lacked a history of self-governance or political institutions and therefore required some mentoring but to start by creating two separate legislative bodies based upon ethnicity works against any possibility of shared cultural experiences. As mentioned earlier Macmillan may have been thinking that partition of the island was the best outcome and was simply laying the groundwork.

Perhaps by clearly stating that goal the outcome for Cyprus it might have avoided the violence that forced the two communities to their respective areas of Cyprus. He certainly had all the necessary players present. Partition was achieved between India and Pakistan so the idea of separate ethnic communities occupying specific geographic areas was not a foreign concept to the British Colonial office. The Macmillan Proposals simply do not coincide with the theorem of nationalism and nations. Perhaps the argument could be made that over time the Greek and Turkish Cypriots might identify differences with Greece and Turkey and then begin to look inward for a different identity but that seems very unlikely.

The rejection of the Macmillan Proposals opened the door for the governments of Greece and Turkey. Perhaps out of sheer exhaustion the British acquiesced to request of

Greece and Turkey to directly negotiate a solution to the Cyprus issue. The result was a constitution that created dual political systems operating under a central government. The constitution institutionalized and therefore eliminated Cypriot identity through mandatory identification with either the Greek and Turkish heritages. Therefore, a separate and cohesive Cypriot identity was not contemplated. The constitution contains the standard political institutions present in modern societies were but they are severely restricted through constitutional amendments.

The executive branch operates as dual power centers with the President being of Greek heritage and the Vice-President being of Turkish heritage each having veto power over the other. The Legislative Assembly follows the same pattern of ethnic separation electing members from separate Greek and Turkish electoral rolls. Certain legislation requires a majority from both the Greek and Turkish Assemblies to become law effectively creating a double majority. Greek and Turkish Communal Chambers operate at the local level managing the day to day affairs of their respective communities. The Communal Chambers are the true political power centers.

The Communal Chambers operated independent educational systems. These educational systems were designed to perpetuate ethnic separation by creating curricula reinforcing the heritage of Greek and Turkey. Operating at the local level and being staffed in part with teachers from Greece and Turkey, there was no opportunity for developing some cross cultural contact. One the most significant issues in developing a nationalist narrative centers on the transference of group loyalties through the elimination of cultural barriers. Group loyalties then become individual loyalties that have the

potential to develop nationalist narratives that may ultimately create a nation comprised of literate citizens educated by their state from a standardized format. Unfortunately, the various programs discussed in this chapter represented a steady but deliberate path towards violence and separation.

CHAPTER THREE

MOTIVATIONS: BRITAIN, GREECE, TURKEY AND THE UNITED STATES

This chapter will demonstrate that the international actors directly involved in the creation of the first Cypriot Republic in fact created a state which lacked the requisites necessary for the development of a shared cultural experience and the creation of the unique nationalist narrative. In 1960 the end state for Cyprus was a constitution negotiated among the sovereign nations of Britain, Greece and Turkey. The convergence of these international actors' interests in Cyprus resulted in the creation of a state operating with dual political systems heavily influenced by Greece and Turkey effectively suppressing cross cultural interaction. What emerged was the development of two national identities: Greek and Turkish. The possibility of a Cypriot identity was never contemplated. Britain retained sovereign base areas, Greece gave up the dream of enosis while Turkey abandoned the idea of a partitioned Cyprus.

Cypriot sovereignty was tenuous at best because the Treaty of Guarantee and the Treaty of Alliance provided the signatories with the authority of independent action to protect the integrity of the agreements. This became obvious to the United States in June of 1963:

Mere existence on paper of those treaties is in itself a source of danger, although no one could successfully argue that those two treaties might serve any useful purpose at all. Furthermore, these treaty arrangements are in direct conflict with the very essence of true independence. Any attempt by any one or other three

countries to intervene would unavoidably lead to very serious situation in Cyprus, with great possibility of wider conflict between Greece and Turkey.¹

These state actors viewed the Cypriot problem through the prism of their own unique nationalist narratives. Each was concerned with preserving their special interests. Britain determined to preserve its military presence in Cyprus and its security obligations to Britain and NATO. Greece having abandoned the objective of enosis [union with Greece] was determined to preserve its position in Cyprus therefore increasing its power in the region and perhaps its prestige within the Western Alliance. Turkey having abandoned the concept of partition was determined to continue its historic attachment to Cyprus while meeting its NATO obligations. The United States as the protectorate of Western Europe focused on the stability of the NATO alliance as a counterbalance to Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe and the Middle East.

British Motivations: Sovereignty on Limited Scale

Ultimately, Britain's interest in retaining control over Cyprus centered on the strategic military value of Cyprus in protecting its influence in the Middle East, supporting NATO and blocking any Soviet intrusion into that portion of the Mediterranean.

¹ United States Department of State, Glenn W. LaFantaise, gen.ed., *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1961-1963, Vol. XVI, Eastern Europe; Cyprus; Greece; Turkey* (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1994) doc. 284, 567.

When questioned by Turkish Foreign Minister Zorlu about the possibility of sovereignty for Cyprus Harold Macmillan while serving as Foreign Minister in September of 1955 made clear to Turkish Foreign Minister Zorlu the following:

Nothing has occurred...in any way to modify that view and I am bound to say that there is no prospect of any change in the foreseeable future...Her Majesty's Government do not accept the principle of self-determination as one of universal application. We think that exceptions must be made in view of geographical, traditional, historical, strategical and other considerations.²

In 1956, The Radcliffe Proposals allowed for the prospect of self-governance but not independence due to British strategic interests. Britain would retain sovereignty over the Island while attempting to reconcile the conflicting interests of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish communities. At the time of the announcement of the proposals, the British government stated:

...that the Greek Cypriots would be given a chance to choose union with Greece if the proposals worked well over a period of time-but, in the event they did opt for enosis, the Turkish Cypriots would also be allowed a separate vote. And if they chose to join Turkey, the Island would be divided.³

The juxtaposition of British sovereignty linked to self-governance while at the same time introducing the concept of partition reveals that the true motivation of the British Government was to retain control of Cyprus.

The British government had no interest in allowing the Greek Cypriots to unify with Greece. In fact the above statement regarding partition by Colonial Secretary Alan

²Naomi Rosenbaum, "Success in Foreign Policy: The British In Cyprus, 1878-1960," *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 3, no.4 (May 1970):625:<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3231542> (accessed October 5, 2012).

³Thomas Ehrlich, "Cyprus, the 'Warlike' Isle, 1030.

Lenox-Boyd was a continuation of Macmillan's earlier attempt of controlling events by creating divisions between Greece and Turkey.⁴ Remarkably, allowing the Cypriot Turkish communities to opt for joining with Turkey and therefore dividing the Island created a situation of "double- determination" for Cyprus.⁵ This formula appears again in the final 1960 settlement with the double majority requirement in the House of Representatives and the Vice-Presidential absolute veto power over Presidential decisions. Partition was so abhorrent to the Greeks that it was thought by the British that faced with the prospect of partition the Greeks would rethink the idea of enosis and acquiesce to the current situation.⁶

Enosis was perceived to be a threat to British interests. In the event of enosis it was felt at the time given the size and organizational strength of the Cypriot Communist party the Greek government would be susceptible to Soviet pressure.⁷ It was also believed that enosis would in fact inhibit the development of self-governance by the Greek and Turkish Cypriots.⁸ Given this the political calculation became that independence would only be acceptable if it aligned with British interests which meant

⁴Adrekos Varvava, "Reinterpreting Macmillan's Cyprus Policy," 82.

⁵Ibid., 83.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Naomi Rosenbaum, "Success in Foreign Policy," 624.

⁸Information Department, *Chatham House Memoranda Cyprus The Dispute and Settlement*, Royal Institute of International Affairs(Oxford: Oxford University Press, June 1959), 12.

that idea of enosis must be set aside.⁹ Retaining control over Cyprus became paramount to Britain with the failure of the Britain to maintain control over the Suez. The fiasco of Suez pointed to the lack of communication that was taking place among Britain and the NATO allies. The failure to retain the Suez in part occurred because of the inability of British forces in Cyprus to properly provide appropriate military power in the Suez due the successful tactics of EKOA in Cyprus during this period.¹⁰

Britain's strategic focus now became centered on supporting the Baghdad Pact causing Macmillan to shift the focus from Britain controlling all of Cyprus to portions of the Island.

Our essential military needs in Cyprus are to secure the continued use of operational airspace, primarily for the support of the Baghdad Pact, and of certain wireless facilities for intelligence and propaganda purposes which cannot be provided elsewhere. These needs can be met if we insist on retaining exclusive British sovereignty over relatively small enclaves.¹¹

The British military cautioned the Cabinet that the above stated objective would be at risk if Britain lost control over Cypriot sovereignty.¹² Macmillan called for a conference with Greece and Turkey requesting that the United States and NATO attend as observers. Britain was hoping that the United States could persuade Athens to attend the conference but the reality was that the United States favored independence. Athens refused to attend

⁹Naomi Rosenbaum, "Success in Foreign Policy," 624.

¹⁰Andrekos Varnava, "Reinterpreting Macmillan's Cyprus Policy," 86.

¹¹ Ibid., 85.

¹²Ibid, 89.

the conference which may have played into British desires to have the conference fail so that the United States would accept in the absence of other options the British plans.¹³

During this period, Britain's political community was becoming restive over the Cyprus situation with British newspapers reporting the stories of the daily violence taking place in Cyprus. "The murder of civilians could turn a public against a tough and uncompromising policy very quickly, while the murder of soldiers and police could create a body-bag condition."¹⁴ Internationally, there had been attempts by Greece at the United Nations to resolve the Cypriot issue and the European Court of Human Rights was questioning the treatment of EKOA detainees under British control in Cyprus.¹⁵ In May of 1958, as a sign of growing frustration with the situation in Cyprus riots erupted in the Turkish Cypriot sector of Nicosia. John Hay Whitney, U.S. Ambassador to Britain cabled the Department of State regarding Cyprus: "It still retains military value for NATO purposes and as stabilizing factor against international communism. HMG remains determined to hold military bases needed for defense against USSR."¹⁶ He went on to state that the Cyprus situation was disruptive to NATO and that Britain was in a mode of

¹³Ibid, 90.

¹⁴Andrekos Varnava, "Reinterpreting Macmillan's Foreign Policy," 91.

¹⁵ Ibid., 91-92.

¹⁶ United States Department of State, *Foreign Policy of the United States, 1958-1960, Vol.X, Part 1*, doc.203,611.

retrenchment and that given the financial burden and negative world opinion they would welcome partners to the share the burden of governance.¹⁷

It had become apparent to Britain that its singular control of Greek and Turkish Cypriot communal affairs was no long feasible since the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities were increasing involved in direct confrontation in the Island while internationally Greece and Turkey were becoming more hostile and negatively affecting Cypriot domestic events. The final maneuver for Britain and its goal to retain Cyprus was the Macmillan Plan which acknowledged the potential role of other governments thorough inviting their participation in managing Cypriot Affairs. The plan makes clear that in the event that Greece and Turkey decline to participate Britain will retain sole sovereignty over the Island. The plan proposed representation by the Greek and Turkish governments in the Cypriot government. The inclusion of Greece and Turkey into the political equation permitted members from each community to become citizens of Greece and Turkey while retaining British nationality effectively eliminating the possibility of a Cypriot identity. The constitution creates two representative bodies one for each community. Partition while not directly stated was implied by the political construct of the Macmillan Plan. The plan as proposed by Macmillan provided for the review of the question of Cypriot sovereignty after seven years effectively guaranteeing continued British control of the Island.

¹⁷Ibid., doc. 203, 611.

The possibilities of an agreement between Greece and Turkey coupled with cooperation in the administration of Cypriot non-military affairs would meet the needs of the British requirement for a reduced span of control in Cyprus while retaining sovereignty. The plan literally blew up when a bomb exploded outside the Turkish Consulate in Nicosia. Britain assigned blame for the act to EKOA when in fact it later learned that a Turkish Cypriot terrorist was responsible.¹⁸ Tensions were further inflamed when Britain created an auxiliary police force comprised primarily of Turkish Cypriots and formed a Turkish Mobile Reserve unit both dedicated to supporting Britain in its battle with EOKA.¹⁹ Creating a police force whose ranks were eighty per cent Turkish Cypriots and a quasi-military units totally from the Turkish Cypriot community in a community which was eighty per-cent Greek Cypriots points to the British strategy of controlling by dividing. Creating division by ethnicity only promulgates violence and prohibits any type of communal cooperation. Greece rejected Macmillan's plan because of concern of the possibility of partition while Turkey recognizing the implied concept of partition accepted the plan. The British cabinet decided to proceed with implementation of the plan.

Yet events were taking place beyond Britain's span of control. Henry Spaak the Secretary General of NATO called an emergency meeting to discuss the Cyprus problem.

Spaak also offered a set of proposals as the basis for further negotiations: the creation of separate assemblies for each of interest to both communities, and the

¹⁸Andrekos Varnava, "Reinterpreting Macmillan's Foreign Policy," 93.

¹⁹Ibid.

appointment of the heads of two communities as advisors to the British Governor. At a September 25 NAC meeting, the Greek Government accepted the Spaak proposals but the Turkish Government angrily rejected them, accusing Spaak of favoring the Greek position.²⁰

Other NATO members backed Spaak's proposal. London then insisted that the Macmillan Plan become part of the NATO discussion. The Greek government decided to attend the conference with the condition that a final settlement would be reached while the British and Turkish governments recognizing that a final settlement would work against their motivations opted to move forward with the Macmillan Plan absent Greek or NATO support.²¹

Macmillan's willingness to go it alone was driven in part by the coup d'état of the friendly Iraqi government in Baghdad resulting in the collapse of the Baghdad Pact. In December of 1958 Britain, Greece and Turkey went before the United Nations to present their perspectives on how best to resolve the Cypriot problem. Britain pushed for support of the Macmillan Plan, Turkey argued for the right of Turkish Cypriot self-determination and Greece argued for the independence.²² The movement of Greece from the position of enosis to independence was the result of the United States voting against the concept of enosis in a United Nations committee session.²³

²⁰ United States Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States 1958-1960, Vol. X, Part 1*, doc. 261, 704-705.

²¹ Andrekos Varnava, "Reinterpreting Macmillan's Foreign Policy," 94.

²² *Ibid.*, 95.

The consequent change in behavior was Greece's, as she abandoned a plan of action that she had thought possible as long as the United States seemed likely to tolerate it. Now a reliable message arrived, and must be taken into account. Greece now could not avoid making an accurate prediction of American response to enosis.²⁴

Turkish Prime Minister Zorlu recognizing that the concept of an independent Cyprus was gaining strength in the United Nations, suggested to Prime Minister Averoff that his Government was willing to accept the possibility of Cypriot independence and that they should hold discussions on this matter.²⁵ Since Macmillan equated Cypriot independence as a loss of British sovereignty he continued to push his plan while stepping up attacks on EKOA instead of encouraging Greece and Turkey to move towards a peaceful solution.

The British Labor Party expressed concern that the Conservative government may be inhibiting the development of a peaceful solution while Prime Ministers Averoff and Zorlu indicated to the Consul of the U S Embassy of Greece that they felt Britain may be trying to prevent a successful outcome of their efforts.²⁶ Macmillan it seemed had created policy which contained a paradox: on the one hand it was essential to British interests to retain sovereignty over a small portion of Cyprus while at the same time inviting the Greeks and Turks directly into the Cypriot political mix while not calculating

²³ Naomi Rosenbaum, "Cyprus and the United Nations: An Appreciation of Parliamentary Diplomacy," *The Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 33, no.2,(May 1967) :224. <http://jstor.org/stable/139773>(accessed January 27, 2009).

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Andrekos Varnava, " Reinterpreting Macmillan's Foreign Policy," 95.

²⁶ Ibid., 98.

that they might agree upon a solution to the Cypriot problem therefore resulting in a complete loss of British control.

The Greeks and Turks did agree to a solution of an independent sovereign state which provided for a perceived democratic state with each community essentially operating separately but with equal power. The cost of the arrangement for the Greeks was enosis and for the Turks partition, each granting to the British two sovereign base areas to be held in perpetuity. The British really had no choice but agree to what had been negotiated in Zurich and London which means in effect means that the decision of Cypriot independence was made by Greece and Turkey. Britain was granted the right to the continued colonization of Cyprus albeit in a micro fashion but none the less operating two sovereign areas as military operations outfitted with all the necessary comforts that the British require. Despite all the machinations on some level it could be argued that Britain achieved its goals: enosis was prevented, Cyprus would remain under the influence of NATO countries blocking the then perceived Soviet threat and it achieved the goal of sovereign territory within a sovereign state which at best stretches the concept of territorial integrity.

Is there any aspect of British policy with regard to Cyprus that aligns with nationalist theorem operating in this thesis? The obvious answer would be no because Britain was only concerned with its military interests. Communal harmony was in the context of British sovereignty. It is interesting that when the British thought about Cyprus beyond the immediate strategic needs, what they perceived where two separate and

distinct ethnic groups. The inhabitants were categorized as either Greek or Turkish but certainly not Cypriot. This became the basic unit of representation manifesting itself in the various political structures Britain developed in its governance of Cyprus. Once the institutionalization of separateness took hold it was no longer feasible for inter-communal development.

The introduction of Greece and Turkey simply reinforced the separateness washing away any concept of being a Cypriot or thinking in terms of a Cypriot nation with territorial boundaries. Nationalism requires among other things the development of a narrative which emerges by the creation of an identity through observation of other cultures permitting differentiation and classification. Providing the option of either a British, Greek or Turkish nationality does not provide for the development of a Cypriot narrative. Britain may have achieved its foreign policy goals but it failed the Cypriot people by not encouraging inter-communal cooperation. Instead of cultivating cultural commonalities, the British concentrated on cultural cleavages guaranteeing ethnic tension.

Greece Motivations: Nationalist Urges

Greece felt that with regard to Cyprus they were operating from a position of strength given that eighty per cent of the population considered itself to be Greek. The objective of Greece for Cyprus was self-determination believing that given the opportunity the Greek Cypriots would vote to join with Greece. Greece not unlike Britain was not necessarily concerned with developing a Cypriot identity. Greece approached

resolution to the Cyprus problem through a number of avenues: with the United States, with Britain, EKOA [Greek Cypriot guerilla operations against the British] and through the United Nations. When MacMillan proposed the Tripartite Conference in 1955, the Greeks objected to the inclusion of Turkey since they felt that Cyprus was essentially a British-Greek issue but Britain insisted by arguing that since security issues would be discussed it was necessary for Turkey to attend given they were an ally to both nations.²⁷ Since the Greeks could not control the participant list and to a degree the agenda and feeling domestic pressure on the topic they pushed for an earlier meeting date by threatening to present the Cyprus issue before the General Assembly.²⁸

The Greeks took the position at the Tripartite Conference that the British recommendation was simply a condominium agreement wherein the majority Greek population would be controlled by the British and the minority Turkish population.²⁹ Greece held the position that Turkey should not have been part of the conference since the issue from the perspective of Greece was one of self-determination for Cyprus and that Greece had given earlier assurances to Turkey that whatever the structure of the final agreement, Turkish minority rights would be protected.³⁰ Britain had made clear during these meetings that neither the international status of Cyprus nor self-determination

²⁷ United States Department of State, John P. Glennon, ed. in chief, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Vol. XXIV, Soviet Union; Eastern Mediterranean* (Washington DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1989), doc.119, 273.

²⁸ Ibid., doc. 121, 275.

²⁹ Ibid., doc. 128, 286.

³⁰ Ibid.

would be discussed then or in the near future. The breakdown of these talks was having an effect beyond Cyprus when Greece announced that it would not participate in previously planned NATO military maneuvers arguing that being in such close proximity to Turkish forces may result in unforeseen consequences.³¹ Leveraging the Cyprus issue in NATO may have been an attempt by Greece to push the United States into a more pro-Greek position on the Cypriot issue.

Greece then moved to placing the Cypriot issue on the 1955 General Assembly agenda. This move demonstrated Greece's desire to be the international spokesperson for Cyprus. The difficulty for Greece became locating enough support in the General Assembly for inclusion of the topic on the agenda. Greece felt it had support with the African, Asian, Latin American and Soviet members. This alignment of support might indicate that Greece was willing to freestyle its diplomacy at the cost of its relationship with the NATO and the Western Alliance. The risk for Britain was that it would lose control of the issue. The United States informed Greek Foreign Minister Stephanopoulos prior to the General Assembly vote on the matter that it would not support the Greek position. Greek reaction to this news was immediate and emotional:

Stephanopoulos predicted, in highly emotional reaction four immediate results following the announcement:

- (1) Government would undoubtedly fall;
- (2) he himself would resign immediately;

³¹Ibid., doc. 128, 287.

(3) Balkan Alliance would collapse; and

(4) serious anti-American riots would break out in Greece.³²

Greek public reaction was as expected; the press portrayed the United States as being uncaring to the plight of the Greek people. Given the economic situation in Greece its dependency on US foreign aid, Greece once again returned to negotiations with the British government. It still continued attempts at pressing the Cypriot issue before the United Nations General Assembly.

The next serious proposal that Greece faced was the Radcliffe Proposals the details of which are located in the previous chapter. Greece requested that they receive advance notice of the proposal prior to their publication so they could manage domestic reaction to the document.³³ Again they took the position that Turkish Cypriot minority rights would be protected and acknowledged British responsibility for internal security, defense and primacy in dealing with international affairs of the Island. Greece did request that after a period of three years Britain would be willing to discuss with the proposed Cypriot government plans for the turn- over to that government of policing responsibilities for Island and allowing for Britain's indefinite right to intervene if it felt necessary.³⁴

In effect Greece was acknowledging continued British sovereignty which would seem in contradiction to their desire for self-determination. In the end Greece rejected the

³² Ibid., doc. 135, 128.

³³ Ibid., doc. 200, 413.

³⁴ Ibid.

Radcliffe Proposals because while proclaiming self-governance the constitution contained an internal conflict which provided the Turkish Cypriot minority with extraordinary political power through its right of veto in the Legislative Assembly effectively creating a double majority. However, in 1958 when facing proposals from the NATO Secretary General and Macmillan continuing to put forward his own plan Greece suggested that they would be agreeable to a plan similar to the Radcliffe Plan.³⁵

The Macmillan Plan of 1958 was received negatively in Greece. The primary objection was the introduction of Turkey into the internal political affairs in Cyprus thereby lessening Greek influence over events. There seemed to a convergence of between the positions of Britain and Turkey on the issue of partition. Greece stated:

Describing the UK plan as “worst yet and completely unacceptable to GOG” Karamanlis vehemently reviewed all Greek objections, described his “increasing internal political difficulties, reiterated Greece was “being abandoned and humiliated” by its friends and allies and flatly predicted he could no longer hold the line here and therefore be compelled to adopt more intransigent position shortly.³⁶

Macmillan’s moved the discussion of his plan to NATO. His desire to push the plan regardless of Greek participation was especially egregious to Greece. Greek Prime Minister Karamanlis informed NATO Secretary General Spaak that Britain’s desire to move forward would affect Greece’s position within NATO.³⁷ Spaak proposed a meeting

³⁵ United States Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1958-1960, Vol. X, Part 1*, doc. 258, 701.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, doc. 246, 684.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, doc. 261, 704.

of the principals but the offer was rejected by Turkey because it was felt that Spaak was favoring the Greek position. The perception of NATO was increasingly negative within Greece as NATO was viewed as supporting the efforts of Colonial powers. Greece seemed to be considering a withdrawal from NATO but it was not clear at the time whether it was just a negotiating position. The Cypriot issue was quickly reaching a stalemate for Greece which forced it to once again to pursue the United Nations strategy.

Prime Minister Averoff seemed convinced that support existed within the United Nations General Assembly for the idea of guaranteed independence for Cyprus. He had once again signaled to the Turkish Embassy the Cypriot constitution would protect Turkish minority rights and a proportionate number of Turkish Cypriot ministers would be established.³⁸ Averoff informed the United States government that it was willing to protect minorities, accept British and NATO military bases and drop the issue of enosis.³⁹

At the same time Averoff requested that should the United States government not be willing to support the resolution it could at least remain neutral thus allowing the possibility of its passage. He also indicated that with an approved General Assembly resolution in hand, Greece may be willing to return the NATO conference. A Columbian resolution supporting the Greek position was put forward but defeated with the United States abstaining. An Iranian proposal was put forward supported by Britain and Turkey proposing that the three affected parties meet outside of the General Assembly for the

³⁸ Ibid., doc. 287, 737.

³⁹ Ibid.

creation of an interim and final solution. The United States supported this resolution and it passed. Greece was now convinced that whatever the solution it would not involve enosis. Perhaps Turkey had reached a similar conclusion with regard to partition.

Given this Prime Minister Averoff and Zorlu entered into direct discussions on how best to resolve the Cypriot issue. The idea was that once the parties had reached some general agreement they would move to include the British. Greece felt that there was a softening in the Turkish position due to domestic pressure and the negative experience in the latest political maneuvering in the General Assembly. Averoff did express some concern about British motivation:

Said there are two elements in British Cabinet: Tory die- hards who are determined to hold Cyprus and will use any means to torpedo talks; others consist of Ministers who are “indifferent to as to Cyprus but on the whole prepared to be “helpful.” He placed Macmillan in latter group. Said Zorlu agreed with him that British Government divided in this fashion and was disturbed.⁴⁰

Perhaps the British had become so focused seeing the problem as a militarily strategic issue and not a communal one, they were got off guard when Greece and Turkey reached an agreement.

Greece was intent on absorbing Cyprus into its state primarily because of its large Greek population. Therefore it did not pursue a policy of communal cooperation but rather communal division. On the one hand Greece chastised Britain for its divide and rule policies but in reality pursued its own policy of divide and rule focusing on the rights of the Greeks in the Island and while giving lip service to minority Turkish rights. The

⁴⁰ Ibid., doc. 306, 764.

final agreement represents the fruits of those efforts—a bifurcated political system allowing each side veto power of the other. Educational institutions lacked a standardized curriculum promoting instead ideas of what it means to be Greek rather than what it meant to be a Cypriot. The elites of Greece created such a system of cleavages that the possibility of communal interaction through such institutions as a common school system or judiciary ultimately resulting in the fracturing of the political system that had been negotiated. Like Britain Greece had no interest doing the hard things like creating a unified political structure but rather took the easy way out.

Turkey Motivations: Status Quo or Partition

Turkey's perspective towards Cyprus had been developed over a period of nearly three hundred years [from 1571 to 1878] of control. Britain. Turkish foreign policy with regard to Cyprus was to maintain the status quo and therefore block any attempts at Cypriot independence and possible union with Greece. The Turkish perspective on Greece could best be summarized by Sir Ivone Kirkpatrick, Permanent Under-Secretary of State, British Foreign Office:

...as far as the Turkish attitude was concerned it was necessary to recall that for five-hundred years the Greeks have been “shouting it from the house tops” that they would like to conquer and dismember Turkey. It was natural in their view of this history that the Turks should oppose the cession to Greece of the last remaining block of Greek-speaking people outside Greek possession.⁴¹

⁴¹ United States Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1957-1959, Vol. XXIV*, doc.168, 351.

The Turks were willing to accept a subservient position in Cyprus because it kept control of Cyprus from Greece. The motivation was based in part on strategic considerations and in part on the Turkish domestic political situation. Approximately two hundred and fifty thousand Turkish Cypriots resided in Turkey proper which gave them political clout in Turkish politics.⁴²

Maintaining the status quo did require taking positions which while firmly held at times worked in concert with British interests. British Foreign Secretary Macmillan's Tripartite Conference of 1955 has been viewed as an example of the British policy of divide and rule. The purpose of the conference was to discuss the prospects of self-government. Turkey had one major concern:

A question from M. Zorlu, the Turkish foreign minister, explicitly posed the issue of a change of sovereignty:
If British Government is determined to maintain sovereignty on the Island, does it, for the present or for the future accept any principle of self-determination which might ultimately lead to the independence of the Island or accession to another country?⁴³

Macmillan replied that Her Majesty's Government did not with regard to Cyprus accept the concept of self-determination.⁴⁴ The British position was driven by separate motivations that aligned with Turkish policies to the extent that Britain would retain sovereignty over Cyprus. Turkey's concern was that self-governance would inevitably lead to self-determination which increased future prospects of union with Greece.

⁴² Ibid ,doc. 175, 364.

⁴³ Naomi Richardson, "Success in Foreign Policy," 625.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 626.

Turkey forcefully pressed its aversion to self-government in multiple venues and with multiple consequences. Vice President Nixon after meeting with Turkish officials in July of 1956 provided the following insight to National Security Council:

Apropos of his visit to Turkey, the Vice President said that he was amazed to find that the Turks had a positively pathological attitude on the Cyprus Problem. The Prime Minister had even gone so far to suggest that if Cyprus was joined to Greece, the Turks would go to war to prevent it.⁴⁵

Greek Ambassador Melas while meeting in the Turkish Embassy indicated that Turkey would be willing to go to war to prevent self-determination or Cypriot independence.⁴⁶

Turkey had indicated to the British Ambassador that any movement with regard to Cyprus towards self-determination would result in the withdrawal of Turkey from NATO.⁴⁷ United States Secretary of State Dulles indicated that Greek Ambassador Melas stated that the Turkish government took the position that any change in the international status of Cyprus would invite a review of the treaty of Lausanne with respect to Western Thrace, the Aegean Islands and the Patriarchate.⁴⁸ In a memorandum regarding Cyprus the Assistant to Secretary of State Dulles indicated that the Turks felt in the event of British desire to be rid of Cyprus control should revert to Turkey because the

⁴⁵ United States Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957* Vol. XXIV, doc. 184,378.

⁴⁶Ibid., doc. 171, 358.

⁴⁷Ibid., doc. 176, 367.

⁴⁸Ibid., doc. 186, 382.

Turkish government does not want another Greek island in close proximity to the Turkish coast nor have Turkish Cypriots under Greek domination.⁴⁹

By January 1958, Turkey had achieved some success in their campaign against Greek desires in Cyprus. In a letter to Secretary of State Dulles, British Foreign Secretary Lloyd wrote:

We cannot abandon assurances which we have given to the Turks, i.e. that the Turkish Cypriot community should have the right to determine its future in just the same way as the Greek Cypriot community. We cannot abandon that position because:

- (a) We publicly pledged ourselves to it;
- (b) It would have a fatal effect on the Turkish Government if we did;
- (c) Opinion here would be very difficult over change;
- (d) Unless we maintain that ultimate position there will be no chance of the Turkish Cypriots co-operating in anything else.

Therefore we propose to maintain our pledge that partition will one of the options open in the event of self-determination.⁵⁰

When Macmillan as Prime Minister proposed his tri-condominium approach to governing Cyprus Turkey felt comfortable in taking the position that partition while a radical solution offered the best resolution to the issue. Running parallel to the Macmillan plan was NATO Secretary General Spaak who was becoming increasingly concerned that Greek-Turkish tensions over Cyprus could create a breach of NATO unity. Foreign Minister Zorlu's reaction to NATO involvement included statements that Turkey

⁴⁹ Ibid., doc. 188, 391.

⁵⁰ United States Department of State, Glenn W. LaFrantaise, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1958-1960, Vol. X, Part 1*, doc. 170, 567-568.

preferred not to have Turk or Greek Cypriot representation at the conference while reiterating partition because in fact 120,000 Turks live in Cyprus.⁵¹ Generally, Turkey was weary of having the Cypriot issue discussed within NATO or the National Atlantic Conference this in part was the result of the it negative experiences in the United Nations General Assembly.

In anticipation of the UNGA and the knowledge that Greece would push for a resolution calling for an independent Cyprus, Turkish diplomats made clear to US diplomats in Turkey that independence does not guarantee the security of Turkey nor the protection of Turkish Cypriots.⁵² Foreign Minister Zorlu again stated Turkish support for the Macmillan plan because it refrigerates the issue for at least seven years.⁵³ The Greek initiative failed by a margin of eleven with twenty-eight abstentions but the fact that the issue of Cypriot was once again being discussed may have lead the Turks to rethink their strategy of partition. In retrospect Prime Minister Zorlu made a stunning statement that the concept of partition should be considered “a kind of intellectual partition”; namely that the two communities must be given the idea that neither was being governed by the other.”⁵⁴ On December 5, Foreign Ministers Averoff and Zorlu agreed on a resolution that called upon all concerned parties to continue to pursue efforts to reach a fair

⁵¹ Ibid., doc. 240, 670-671.

⁵² Ibid., doc. 289, 742.

⁵³ Ibid., doc. 291, 746.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

settlement to the Cypriot issue. The resolution was passed unanimously without debate by the General Assembly.

At this point Turkey engaged in direct talks with Greece primarily motivated by the harsh rhetoric and the results of the Greek initiative in the UNGA, the growing concern over events in the Middle East with respect to Iran and Iraq, growing domestic at ease with the issue and finally the prospect of a British Labor Government coming to power which historically had favored the Greek position of independence. Turkey had moved away from Britain by engaging Greece directly thereby placing them in a position to directly control a solution to the Cypriot issue. The Zurich Agreement provided Turkey with a foreign policy victory in that it achieved partition in the sense that the Cypriot constitution institutionalized ethnic separateness. What the agreement failed to achieve was the development of an international program dedicated to the idea of developing a Cypriot identity through mutual inter-communal cooperation perhaps leading to a nationalist narrative that would have given the Cypriot people a foundation from which to build and sustain a nation. Turkey's focus on ethnicity versus statecraft contributed to the failure of the First Cypriot Republic.

United States Motivation: Keeping It All Together

In August of 1956 the government of the United States had prepared a white paper detailing its goals with respect to Cyprus. The immediate considerations included:

1. Resumption of constructive talks among Britain, Greece and Turkey to avoid potentially hostile debate in the United Nations General Assembly.

2. To achieve a level of success in those talks that resolves the Cyprus problem as a significant achievement of NATO.
3. Mitigate the neutralist and communist opposition to the Karamanlis Government in Greece on the Cypriot issue.
4. Improve the strategic position of the Western Alliance in the region thereby relieving British occupied in Cyprus for use in broader operations in the Middle East.⁵⁵

The end state would be the elimination of tensions and a strengthened NATO and Balkan Alliance, permanent British bases in Cyprus, guarantees of self-determination and the protection of minority rights, and assurances to Turkey that Cyprus would not pose a threat to its security.⁵⁶

The United States envisioned the election of a constituent committee which would develop a constitution crafted in part from the Radcliffe Proposals. The constitution would remain in force for a period of ten years at which time a plebiscite would be held. Plebiscite would permit choice of one of the following:

- a. Union with Greece
- b. Local autonomy under the Greek Crown
- c. Full independence
- d. Self-government within the Commonwealth.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ United States Department of State, John P. Glennon, Ed. in Chief, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957, Vol. XXIV*, doc. 188, 385.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 386.

Cyprus would provide British military bases which would be permanent and considered sovereign territory. Greece would not be allowed to station troops in the Island regardless of the plebiscite outcome unless authorized by NATO. NATO would guarantee the final agreements. Comments with respect to Turkey are as follows:

Turkey must recognize that in interests of NATO and Western defenses, the United States and the United Kingdom must go ahead with a settlement and Turkey has no legal or moral right to block it. The Allied powers are doing all possible to safeguard Turkey's legitimate interests.⁵⁸

The United States was committed to providing the Cypriot people with the opportunity to select its own unique form of self-government. Elections would be supervised from the NATO community but would not include the parties directly involved.

NATO was an essential element to the process because it was seen by the United States as a demonstration of Allied unity. Cypriot sovereignty would be protected but with limitations due to the sovereign base issue. Reaction to the US proposals was varied. The British seemed inclined to proceed with the implementation of the Radcliffe Proposals on a unilateral basis indicating they had no desire for negotiations. Greece suggested that the plebiscite be held after three years. They were amenable to a any solution that they felt could be justified to their domestic political audience. Turkey indicated that because of negative public reaction they could not support the proposal.

United States policy on Greece focused was based primarily on its strategic military value. Greece's proximity to the Soviet Bloc, the Near East, its NATO

⁵⁸ Ibid., 389.

membership, its border with Turkey and relationship with Yugoslavia made it a significant component to US interests in blocking Soviet access to the Mediterranean. Greece looked favorably upon the United States for a number of reasons one of them being Cyprus. Regarding Cyprus the United States observed with respect to Greece:

The Cypriot problem has become the dominant issue in Greek politics and foreign policy. It has absorbed the energies of the Greek Government, diverted attention from the problems of economic development, and caused the rigidity of Greece's foreign policy and serious strains with its major allies.⁵⁹

Solving the Cyprus problem was important to the United States because it would insure internal political stability and the continuation of a moderately conservative government in support of US policies.

Specific United States policy objectives were motivated by regional military considerations fitting into larger global obligations. Therefore it was necessary that Greece:

1. Remain stable and independent with the ability to resist communism
2. That it provide access to military forces of the United States and NATO.
3. Greek armed forces capable of resisting in conjunction with other countries an armed attack by Soviet forces.
4. It helps to achieve a settlement to the Cyprus issue.
5. Reduces ideas of Greek irredentism.
6. Greek focus on economic development in order to offset cost of Greek military structure.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Ibid., doc. 308, 587.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 591.

The relationship with Greece seems purely transactional. A complete review of the US policy objectives memo never speaks in terms of cultural commonalities or historical associations but in terms of how Greece can best support US efforts to combat Soviet aggression. It is understandable that in that time and place the US position would be such but one also imagines that absent the issue of communism and the Soviet Union the US-Greek dynamic may not have fit into the world view of the United States.

The United States perspective with regard to Turkey is quite different. The opening comments of the Statement of Policy on Turkey clearly state that Turkey was a natural ally because its' world view aligns with US policy.⁶¹ Turkey's geographic location was of strategic value to US military policy because of the Black Sea and its geography which provides direct land access to the Soviet Union and the Suez. The United States speaks admiringly of Turkey's political and social progress:

Turkey is undergoing one of the most successful social, political and intellectual revolutions of modern times. Turkey desires to become a fully modern state based on western cultural ideas and has been developing democratic forms of government and institutions. From an inefficient, tyrannical and theocratic state, it has reached a point where, in some respects, it can well serve as an example of peaceful evolution for other underdeveloped areas.⁶²

The US did express some concern that perhaps Turkish efforts at political and social development had negatively affected its' focus on creating economic programs that would foster growth and ultimately lessen their demands for continued US financial aid.

⁶¹ Ibid., doc.320,620.

⁶² Ibid., 622.

The US policy speaks of Turkey's international relationships in some detail. Turkey's attitude toward the Western Europe was positive and dynamic. It had developed constructive arrangements with Britain and France. Its near abroad strategy was one of cooperation with Greece and Yugoslavia. Turkey was engaged in dialogue with Pakistan searching for common agreement on security issues. Turkey's diplomacy in the Middle East was encouraging stronger regional ties which would strengthen the position of Western Europe in that region. Most importantly Turkey's was deeply committed to resist any attempt by the Soviet Union to undercut the internal political stability of the country while supporting NATO efforts to block its influence in Western Europe. Noticeably absent is any reference to Cyprus.

The policy objectives of the United States with regard to Turkey can be summarized as follows:

- a. Turkey remains a sovereign state operating in concert with Western Europe in its efforts to resist Soviet aggression.
- b. That Turkey's military continue to operate at a high level of efficiency so that it may properly support the larger allied military efforts in event of Soviet attack.
- c. That it grant military access to designated facilities by United States and military forces.
- d. That it continue to support NATO and its regional partners.
- e. That Turkey engages the Arab States in positive dialogue.
- f. That Turkey's economic development is such that maximizes its ability to pay a larger share of its military expenditures.⁶³

⁶³ Ibid.

United States expectations for Turkey were high based in part on their geographic location and perhaps in part on their Ottoman historical past. Turkey had the institutional memory of its past relationships which served it well in meeting its own as well as Western European expectations. In many ways Turkey remains an example of the contingencies required for the development of cultural commonalities that lead to a nationalist narrative and the construct of a modern nation.

We have discussed US policy goals with respect to the principal partners involved in the Cypriot issue. Central to all of these relationships was how these countries could best serve the global policy interests of the United States in its efforts to contain the global hegemonic desires of the Soviet Union. Cyprus because of its strategic geographic location made it ground zero for maintaining the stability of NATO the essential institution for the defense of Western Europe. A number of factors influenced and heightened the tensions within and without Cyprus. Communist activity within Greece had been quite destructive to its social and political fabric. Communist activity was ultimately contained but it may have spawned an irredentist urge within Greece. Greece's irredentism spilled over into Cyprus upsetting Britain's tenuous political and control over the Island and causing significant strains within NATO and negatively affectively US policy goals.

The United States played a supportive role in seeking a solution to the Cypriot issue by generally supporting British efforts to resolve the problem. However, the end state for Cyprus in 1960 did not match completely match US policy goals for Cyprus. An

October 6, 1959 National Intelligence Estimate expressed a number of concerns with the agreements targeting the complicated structure of the newly formed state. The assessment makes clear that the agreement failed to resolve the then present anxieties within the Greek and Turkish communities. There was concern that the dual power sharing arrangement tended to perpetuate rather than mend the social cleavages providing room for those factions dedicated to enosis or partition to maneuver. The communist party had a strong presence in the labor unions.

The United States primary concern was maintaining the Western Alliance so that the Soviet Union could be stymied in its efforts to protect its interests in areas beyond their immediate borders. Cyprus, Greece and Turkey were part of Soviet strategy. The United States calculated as did the negotiating parties that preservation of NATO was paramount to addressing a just solution for Cyprus. Strategic military needs were achieved with sovereign bases allowing NATO the ability to project its power into those regions of interests.

CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this project was the development of a hybrid theorem of nationalism which could be used to analyze ideas of nationalism and nations in the Radcliffe Proposals, the Macmillan Plan, and the London-Zurich agreements which became the founding document for the first Republic of Cyprus. Hopefully, this study has demonstrated that state creation requires a nationalist narrative. Nationalism if properly achieved can prevent inter-communal violence in this case along ethnic lines. The lack of nationalist narrative most often results in the breakdown of the state and creates tensions beyond its boundaries into the international community.

The case of Cyprus was used to explore a certain aspect of the conflict as it relates to ideas about nationalism and nations. It was the lack of a nationalist narrative that resulted in the failure of the first Republic of Cyprus. Nationalism in many ways remains a riddle. Anderson argues that the nation is an imagined political community that is at once limited and sovereign. Because it is not possible for every citizen to have knowledge of all the members of the political community nationalism is imagined. Nationalism is generally contained or limited by internationally recognized boundaries.

The origin of national sovereignty was derived in the age of the Enlightenment which shattered the old divinely ordained political structures. The concept of an imagined community occurs because even though social inequalities exist all of its citizens possess deep feelings for their community. Nations were preceded by nationalism which according to Anderson began with the advent of the print capitalism wiping away the

older more elite languages operating on a global scale and targeting local markets.

Nationalism and nations for Anderson are located in modernity.

Gellner views nationalism and nations as being intended for each other but before they become linked they must emerge independent and contingent. Gellner has in mind multiple contingencies. The first contingency occurs when people identify with the same nation because they recognize the symbols, common behavior practices and communication processes that allow them to participate in the shared culture. The second contingency occurs when the inhabitants of a nation recognize differences but commit themselves mutual rights because they see each other as equals.

Gellner places a premium on literacy because over time it created opportunities across a broad spectrum of social activities resulting in the establishment of a standardized script and the potential for the storage of cultural and cognitive knowledge. This event in and of itself did not result in social cohesion. That would take place in industrial society with the emergence of rationalist thinking. Facts drive knowledge which supports problem solving creating more efficient industrial activities. Standardized operating manuals are required to operate sophisticated machinery. This requires a literate population, an endeavor that only the state has the capability to create and maintain. High rates of literacy create a high culture which represents a new social structure that is introspective but dependent upon a standardized educational system which provides each societal group a common platform from which to operate resulting in social cohesion.

At this point it might be helpful to restate the operational hybrid theorem developed in the second chapter. Nationalism and nations have links to a specific historical past. Nationalism needs the presence of other cultures so that comparisons, definitions, and categorization occur to craft its unique narrative. Nations will only emerge when society moves beyond its local perspective and coalesces around a shared inclusive cultural narrative. That transition ultimately results in the development of a unified political system. This phenomenon resides in modernity as an historical period identified with a sophisticated culture that relies on large standardized educational systems. Finally, understanding the seeds necessary for its emergence will not necessarily result in predicting the locations where nationalism and nations might appear.

Today, after four centuries of living in close proximity to each other with frequent inter-communal interaction, the Greek and Turkish Cypriots remain divided along political, cultural, religious and separate languages. Did Cyprus when viewed apart from Britain, Greece and Turkey possess any of the basic historical commonalities that could produce social cohesion? Cyprus does have an historical past that is rich with layers of occupation. This could be viewed negatively or positively. The negative argument would state that the weight of the layers suppressed the development of a shared culture experience because the inhabitants of Cyprus were focused on the priorities of the new rulers. The argument is valid but it is largely applicable to the native elites who would have direct and on-going with the regime. The majority of the Cypriots were tied to the land which required their full attention so the appearance of a new ruling power while

apparent generally the effect was probably limited to issues of taxation but in any event did not change their daily existence.

The Ottoman experience again depending on perspective contained some interesting characteristics. Native Cypriots identified themselves as either Orthodox or Muslim. According to Adamantia Pollis there was a significant amount of inter-communal interaction: intermarriage between Orthodox and Muslim, contemporary Greek Cypriots with names of Turkish derivation and sharing of churches for Orthodox or Muslim religious services. The elite power holders came from the Orthodox and Muslim communities. The same pattern of integration was also present within the agricultural and administrative communities. Pollis also states village elections were not separated between Orthodox or Muslim and that as late as 1960 forty-two per cent of the villages were mixed.

Social separation occurred along the lines of an individual's economic capabilities. Social identification by ethnicity was not present. Social elites from both communities operated in concert managing their communities. It was a type of shared cultural experience that may have transcended into a common shared culture. That of course was contingent upon the authoritarian rule of the Ottoman Empire. Still it could be argued there was nothing inherent in Ottoman rule that would have set the stage for identification by ethnicity. One of the essential elements in the theorem requires the presence of another cultural which can in certain conditions result in the creation of a narrative that moves both cultures into a shared culture. At this stage of Cypriot history

they lacked many of the other elements but the existence of two cultures within close proximity to each other had potential.

The process of social identification by ethnicity arrived with the British who viewed the Cypriots as two distinct groups. As such the rudimentary political structures that were implemented contained political units based upon ethnicity operating at the local level. The British in 1918 being a high culture recognized the importance of education sought to reduce the high rate of illiteracy in the Island. A commendable idea but Greek and Turkish Boards of the Education were created. In order to achieve proper staffing levels the British encouraged the importation of teachers from the mainland of Greece and Turkey. Curricula lacked standardization and focused on the teaching of Greek and Turkish languages and the unique cultural heritage of each country. A curriculum targeting Cypriot identity did not exist. A standardized state sponsored educational system provides a common platform of education ideally providing the economic system with adequate number of highly trained people to maintain growth. It also serves as environment of cross cultural inter-action. The creation by the British of two educational systems had the effect of sharpening cultural differences reinforcing the fragmentation of social organization.

The British like the ruling powers that preceded them were primarily concerned with safeguarding their strategic military interests. Retaining sovereign control of Cyprus was paramount in achieving that objective. The difficulty for the British was the restiveness of the Greek Cypriot population. The British have made the claim that the

enosis movement was in place when they took control of Cyprus in 1878. Greece became an independent state in 1831 creating numerous irredentist claims one of which included Cyprus. Slowly due to contacts between Greek and Cypriot Orthodox clergy an orientation towards being Greek emerged. This event running parallel to the separate educational systems pushing Greek cultural and heritage created an orientation that was Greek but not necessarily Cypriot. Conversely, the reform movement of the Young Turks in 1908 began to inspire ideas of Turkish nationalism in mainland Turkey but not necessarily in Cyprus.

In retrospect Britain seemed blind to the grassroots efforts of Greece and Turkey in preserving their respective cultural heritages through the educational process. What was being created was system of cultural connectivity crossing state boundaries. This was the beginning of the internationalization of the Cypriot problem. By the mid 1950's the British were beginning to experience the full effects of this reality. Britain had experienced significant strategic military setbacks in the Middle East the first of which was the loss of control of the Suez. During this period it was engaged in an aggressive and violent struggle with the Greek Cypriot freedom fighters known as EKOA. The British needed a way to ameliorate the situation.

In 1956 Lord Radcliffe was assigned the task of creating a Cypriot constitution. Cognizant of ethnic mistrust he proposed a constitution which focused on a political system that met the needs of both groups. Britain would retain sovereign control of Cyprus while enjoying a limited form of self-government. In an effort to mitigate the

effects of majority rule Radcliffe proposed a Legislative Assembly which contained fixed numbers of Greek and Turkish Cypriots. Any proposed legislation that would alter the then current legislation at the time of implementation would require a majority vote from with the Turkish Legislative Assembly. This provision allowed for a “double majority” negating the concept of majority rule. One of the elements of the nationalist theorem is the development of a unified government which recognizes the equality of all its citizens and values the concept of majority rule.

Radcliffe’s offered more positive considerations with respect to education. He chose not to eliminate the then present dual educational systems but suggested a more standardized inter-communal process. He argued that students in daily contact with each other would over time begin to understand and appreciate the cultural differences that existed. They would also enjoy the benefits of a standardized curriculum. Radcliffe’s idea about education aligns with the nationalist theorem for a couple of reasons. The theorem requires the presence of other cultures so differences can be observed and comparisons take place resulting in the development of a unique cultural narrative. The daily observations by students of cultural differences, creates opportunities for those students to move beyond their local perspective and coalesce around a larger more inclusive circle.

The inter-communal violence that was taking place in Cyprus became justification for Greek and Turkish involvement. Cyprus became a focal point in the internal politics of Greece and Turkey heightening the tension between the two countries. Prime Minister

Macmillan attempted to mitigate the situation by offering a shared power arrangement creation of two distinct Houses of Representatives. This proposed power sharing arrangement targets the differences within the Cypriot community. The plan failed to meet the needs of either the Greeks or the Turks. The Macmillan Plan also fails to meet the prescriptions of the nationalist theorem because it essentially “silos” each political community while orientating them to identities beyond the shores of Cyprus. Again this plan limits the need for cross cultural interaction thereby keeping each community within the boundaries of their local communities. The theorem requires a shared culture which produces a common narrative resulting in a united political system.

The signing of the Zurich-London Agreements in February 1959 established that Cyprus would be an independent state. In August of 1960 Cyprus became an internationally recognized state but not a nation. The word state is applicable because the Cypriot constitution institutionalizes the history of past political and social separation. The constitution memorializes communal dualism by providing separate and essentially equal government political systems operating under the structure of a weak central government. The constitution as constructed became the ideal instrument by which all the fears, mistrust and anxieties that had developed between the communities were codified with the desired intent to wall each community off from the other: preventing the creation of an inter-communal interaction and the possibility of a shared culture.

The creation of the first Republic of Cyprus was of an international compromise.

It was orchestrated by three countries with different nationalist narratives. Nationalism emerged in Britain around multiple ethnic groups which crafted an ideal about what meant to be British. Greece created its' nationalist narrative in the first part of the nineteenth century reaching back to its historical past and blending it with the Orthodox faith. Turkey came relatively late beginning in the early twentieth century. It is apparent that ethnicity resides in the Greek and Turkish nationalist narrative. These differing nationalist narratives negatively affected resolution to the Cypriot problem what became paramount was protecting their individual state interests. None of the negotiating parties sought to create the foundations necessary for the creation of a Cypriot identity.

The British were committed to retaining some form sovereignty while Greece and Turkey sought to retain influence over what they perceived to be extensions their respective communities. This dynamic had the effect of creating significant tensions within the NATO alliance. This caught the attention of the United States. The United States deferred to the British with regard to Cyprus which in retrospect may have indirectly contributed to the collapse of the Cypriot governments. During this period the United States was beginning to experience racial unrest while absorbing Hawaii and Alaska into the Union so the concept of government by ethnicity must have seemed like an odd political construct. A US national Security Council Report in February of 1960 observed:

The Zurich-London Agreements institutionalize the historic separateness of the four-fifths Greek majority and one-fifth Turkish minority in Cyprus in an intricate and delicately balanced governmental framework. Essentially a federation along ethnic lines, the arrangement can only work successfully with the good will of the

Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities and the continued cooperation of the Greek and Turkish governments. There are no indications that the establishment of an independent Cyprus will give rise to a specifically Cypriot nationalism.¹

This is may not be the only reference to the idea of Cypriot nationalism but the concept was certainly absent from the lexicon of the founding fathers of the first Cypriot Republic.

The tool kit for rising states remains limited. In the case of Cyprus it was particularly limited. Cyprus was created as a result of an international compromise and without the benefit of an election by the Cypriot people. Nationalism represents one of the tools available to rising states in their efforts to maintain social cohesion. Nationalism presented itself in Cyprus through two competing regional powers. The result was that each ethnic community rallied around the banners that were familiar to them but unfortunately they were the banners of other countries.

Success was ultimately contingent upon the actions of Greece and Turkey which simply attempted to impose their cultural narratives on the communities they represented in Cyprus. The common benefit for all concerned was that the Greek and Turkish communities attached themselves to a narrative they understood the common difficulty was implementing the constitution which accentuated ethnic separateness. In the final analysis each group took the easy way out. The hard task would have to attempt to

¹ United States Department of State, Glenn W. LaFantasie, gen. ed., *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1958-1960, Vol. X, Part 1*, doc.347,821.

understand the problem and collectively work towards a shared culture. If that approach had been taken the first Cypriot Republic may still be in existence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Benedict, R. O'G. *Imagined Communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso, 2006.
<http://o-handle.net.library.laussy.georgetown.edu/2027/heb.01606> (accessed January 16, 2012).
- Bolukbasi, Shua. "The Cyprus Dispute and the United Nations: Peaceful Non-Settlement between 1954 and 1996," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 30, no. 3 (August, 1998). <http://www.jstor.org/stable/16428> (accessed January 27, 2009).
- Chatzevasieiou, Euanthes. *The Cyprus Question, 1878-1960: The Constitutional Aspect*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2002.
- Erlich, Thomas. "Cyprus, the 'Warlike Isle': Origins and Elements of the Current Crisis," *Stanford Law Review* 18, no. 6 (May, 1966).
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1227122> (accessed September 9, 2009).
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism. 2nd ed.* Cornell: Cornell University Press, 2006.
- Glennon, John P., ed. United States Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1955-1957 Volume XXIV Soviet Union Eastern; Mediterranean*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1989.
- Hakki, Mura Metin, ed. *The Cyprus Issue A Documentary History, 1878-2007*. London: I.B.Tauris, 2007.
- Joseph, Joseph S. *Cyprus: Ethnic Conflict and International Concern*. New York, P.Lang, 1985.
- LaFantaise, Glenn W. gen. ed. United States Department of State, *Foreign Policy of the United States, 1958-1960 Volume X Part 1 Eastern Europe Region; Soviet Union; Cyprus*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1993.
- LaFantaise, Glenn W. gen. ed. United States Department of State, *Foreign Policy of the United States, 1961-1963 Volume XVI Cyprus; Eastern Europe; Greece; Turkey*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1994.
- Miller, James Edward. *The United States and the making of modern Greece: history and power*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.

- O'Leary, Brendan, "On the Nature of Nationalism: An Appraisal of Ernest Gellner's Writings on Nationalism," *British Journal of Political Science* 27, (April 27, 1997). www.jstor.org.proxy.library.georgetown.edu/stable/194137 (accessed November 4, 2012).
- Pollis, Adamantia, "Intergroup Conflict and British Colonial Policy: The Case of Cyprus," *Comparative Politics* 5, no.4(July, 1973). <http://jstor.org/stable421397> (accessed January 27, 2012).
- Richmond, Oliver P. "Sovereignty and Negotiating Positions in the Cyprus Conflict: Obstacles to a Settlement," *Middle Eastern Studies* 35, no.3.(July,1999). <http://www.jsotr.org/stable/42840423>.
- Radcliffe, Lord Cyril. *Constitutional Proposal for Cyprus*. London: H.M.S.O.,1956. www.limcdigital.orggeorgetown.edu/docdisplay.aspx?textid=43679708. (accessed January 16, 2012).
- Rosenbaum, Naomi. "An Appreciation of Parliamentary Diplomacy," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 33, no. 2. (May,1967). <http://jstor.org/stable/139773> (accessed January 27,2009).
- Rosenbaum, Naomi. "Success in Foreign Policy: The British in Cyprus, 1878-1960," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 3, no. 4 (December, 1970). <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3231542> (accessed October 5, 2012).
- Royal Institute of International Affairs, Information Department, *Cyprus, the Dispute and the Settlement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Soulioti, Stella. Fwd. by Claire Palley. *Fettered Independence: Cyprus, 1878-1964, Volume 1*. Minneapolis:University of Minnesota, 2006.
- World Constitutions Illustrated*, "Draft Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus 1960." <http://0-www.heinonline.org.gull.georgetown.edu>(accessed October 12, 2012).
- Varnava, Andrekos, "Reinterpreting Macmillan's Cyprus Policy, 1957-1960," *The Cypriot Review* 22, no.1 (Spring 2010) <http://search.proquest.com/docview/74880911>(accessed October 1, 2012).